Swansea University
Prifysgol Abertawe

Cronfa
Setting Research Free

Swansea University E-Theses

Bringing the Renaissance to Tudor England: The role of Richard Fox and his frieze at St. Cross, Winchester.

Riall, Nicholas John Erskine

How to cite:

Riall, Nicholas John Erskine (2005) *Bringing the Renaissance to Tudor England: The role of Richard Fox and his frieze at St. Cross, Winchester..* thesis, Swansea University.
http://cronfa.swan.ac.uk/Record/cronfa42584

Use policy:

This item is brought to you by Swansea University. Any person downloading material is agreeing to abide by the terms of the repository licence: copies of full text items may be used or reproduced in any format or medium, without prior permission for personal research or study, educational or non-commercial purposes only. The copyright for any work remains with the original author unless otherwise specified. The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holder. Permission for multiple reproductions should be obtained from the original author.

Authors are personally responsible for adhering to copyright and publisher restrictions when uploading content to the repository.

Please link to the metadata record in the Swansea University repository, Cronfa (link given in the citation reference above.)

http://www.swansea.ac.uk/library/researchsupport/ris-support/

Bringing the Renaissance to Tudor England:

The role of Richard Fox and his frieze at St Cross, Winchester

Volume 1 - Text

Nicholas John Erskine Riall

Submitted to the University of Wales in fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Wales Swansea

2005

ProQuest Number: 10805342

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

ProQuest 10805342

Published by ProQuest LLC (2018). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.
This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

UNIVERSITY OF
LIBRARY

Nicholas Riall

Bringing the Renaissance to Tudor England: The role of Richard Fox and his frieze at St Cross, Winchester

Summary of Ph.D.

This dissertation explores the introduction of the Renaissance style into the artistic patronage of early Tudor England, focussing on the activities of Richard Fox, bishop of Winchester 1501-28. Central to this enquiry is a Renaissance frieze that Fox commissioned for the church of the Hospital of St Cross in *c.*1515-17. I argue that this was probably one of the earliest settings to be created in the new *all'antica* style, and reveal that Fox's frieze has striking affinities with a suite of stalls created for Cardinal d'Amboise for his château of Gaillon, in Normandy.

The first part of this dissertation explores the life of Cardinal d'Amboise, and the Gaillon stalls. There follows a brief biography of Bishop Fox and his artistic patronage. In the central section, I present a full, detailed description of the frieze at St Cross and how this was arranged in its primary setting. Subsequent chapters explore aspects of the frieze: in particular the medallions and the figurines of sybils. In the final section, I show that the presence of the St Cross frieze prompted the creation of another suite of work, a set of stalls for Prior Silkstede in Winchester Cathedral. These in turn, I argue, influenced the designs in reconstructing the presbytery screens in the cathedral during the early 1520s. I show that these were probably the work of Bishop Fox's mason, who I identify as Thomas Bertie. Analysis of these screens reveals at least four other funereal monuments and two chapels, including the Draper chantry chapel in Christchurch Priory, which were built in a similar *all'antica* style. All these structures can be shown to have been fashioned by Thomas Bertie during the 1520s.

The research for this dissertation has benefited from the advent of and improvements to digital photography which enabled me to photograph every setting in great detail, and permitted this thesis to be profusely illustrated.

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed (candidate)

Date 23 June 2005

STATEMENT 1

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by footnotes giving explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed (candidate)

Date 23 June 2005

STATEMENT 2

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed (candidate)

Date 23 June 2005

Foreword

In the summer of 1985 while directing an archaeological excavation at Borelli Yard (in Farnham, Surrey) I found myself confronted for the first time by the problem of how to deal with a medieval roof tile kiln and its products. Let me explain right away that archaeologists dislike building materials of all kinds, especially brick and tile, unless there is an artistic or sculptural element such as may be seen in floor tiles or cut stonework. Brick and tile were, in 1985, largely a neglected resource that was bulky and difficult to analyse. Most archaeologists tended to give the material the minimum of attention, preferring instead to concentrate on more interesting material such as pottery. The Borelli excavation was run as a Job Creation Programme project, which ensured I had plenty of manpower, but not all of whom were ideally suited to the physical demands of on-site archaeology. I was able therefore to give two of my team the task of building an archive of every roof tile kiln excavation and every significant publication of roof tile as a material. One of the most striking results of this literature survey was to discover that in virtually every excavation report published up to 1985, the material itself – the roof tiles – were described as single exemplars with very little, if any, indication of size ranges. Quite by chance, within the following five years I became involved in a further three roof tile kiln excavations and was fortunate enough to have the lead role in undertaking the post-excavation analysis and in publishing the results. It had seemingly never occurred to earlier archaeologists that detail was interesting, but in the publications with which I have had a hand, a principal ambition has been to provide a wealth of detail. One of the most significant results was that in all four kiln excavations we found that there were at least four discrete forms of tile

involved and in one there was no less than seven, for all of which there were significant size ranges.

My analysis of tile was (and remains) predicated on accurate observations, on the taking of measurements and weights, but most fundamentally on recognising characteristic differences, whether it was because a glaze might or might not be present or where the peg hole was placed on the tile and how it was made. I believe detail is important. When I came to explore *all'antica* carving, I soon discovered that one of the basic tools with which such a study can be furthered was substantially absent – there was no corpus of published work that provided a detailed analysis of *all'antica* motifs. In fact there was not even a comprehensive and full survey of sites across England that possessed *all'antica* work. In my work on *all'antica* carving, I have used the same methodology that I applied to analysing assemblages of roof tile – detailed observation is key. I have therefore had no qualms about providing detailed descriptions of the sites that I describe in this thesis; my point is that in all cases, except for the material within Winchester cathedral, the sites are virtually unknown or, in the case of the Draper and Pole chantries in Christchurch priory and the frieze at St Cross, largely unillustrated. Nevertheless, even where some of the sites have been explored previously, I have found that sustained and rigorous analysis has revealed further details that had previously either not been noticed or had not been reported. In a sense therefore, this thesis serves to provide a corpus of *all'antica* work wherein each site that is examined is described in great detail – thereby serving to provide in many cases the first actual survey of individual sites – which therefore permits the individual to be compared and contrasted with the whole. This methodical and exhaustive approach, supplemented by large numbers of digital photographs, I believe provides the building blocks for a wider enquiry and allows a fully critical appraisal of previous work and, as a result, shows far more clearly the impact of the early use of *all'antica* decorative work in early Tudor England.

VOLUME 1 - Contents

Section 3 – Thomas Bertie, 'my lorde of Wynchestres mason'

VOLUME 2 ~ DVD

Figures

Fig 15. St Denis, Paris, Gaillon stalls: north range, viewed from the west with seats up. The marquetry panels featuring sibyls in the lower tier above the seat backs show up well in this picture. Note also the marquetry work on the lower sections of the side faces of the arm rests.

Fig 16. Gaillon stalls: showing component parts (after Liou 1997).

Fig 17. Gaillon stalls: one of the G1 historiated panels, featuring scenes from the life of St George; the panel shown here depicting his crucifixion.

Fig 18. Woodwork from Gaillon at the Musée de la Renaissance at Ecouen. The capped posts with pilasters offer strong parallels to the work at St Cross.

Figs 19 and 20. Ecouen & St Denis, Paris: Gaillon stalls, panel from desk (top) and from seat back panels (G4).

Figs 21 and 22. St Denis, Paris: Gaillon stalls, detail of panel from seat backs (G4).

Figs 23, 24 and 25. Gaillon stalls: underside of tipping seats (G9) showing misericords and rinceaux.

Fig 26, 27, 28 and 29. Gaillon stalls: close-up detail of four types of bottom boards.

Figs 30, 31 and 32. Gaillon stalls: the G15 canopy panels featuring designs showing central urns with winged putto heads and grotesque supporters in rinceaux style.

Figs 33 and 34. Gaillon: the Loggia built against the Grant Maison in 1508-9 Pierre Fain.

Fig 35. Rouen Cathedral: The tomb of Cardinal Georges d'Amboise and his nephew, also Georges d'Amboise, by Roullant le Roux after 1515.

Fig 36. The estate of the bishops of Winchester showing the major manors spread across southern England.

Fig 37. A reconstruction of the palace at Bishop's Waltham, Hampshire, viewed from the south-west.

Fig 38. Winchester Cathedral: ground plan showing the east end of the cathedral (from VCH Hampshire).

Fig 39. Winchester Cathedral: the presbytery vault, from the west, showing the range of bosses fixed to the wooden tracery of the vault.

Fig 71. Church of St Cross Hospital: The Morning Chapel section showing bay and corbel figurine numbers. Scale 200mm.

Fig 72. Church of St Cross Hospital: Corner post (post 14) with candelabra strings carved on two faces.

Fig 73 and 74. Church of St Cross Hospital: Technical drawing showing the construction of the frieze with a section and plan through one bay; with photograph showing detail of frame S5u from the west.

Figs 75 and 76. Church of St Cross Hospital: wooden blocks fixed to the back of the frieze.

Fig 77. Church of St Cross: Frame N1u with posts 1 and 2.

Fig 78. Church of St Cross: Frame N2u with posts 2 and 3, and showing medallion with Fox's badge of a vulning pelican.

Fig 79. Church of St Cross: Frame N3u with posts 3 and 4, and displaced medallion from R1.

Fig 80. Church of St Cross: Frame N4u with posts 4 and 5, and medallion featuring a woman.

Fig 81. Church of St Cross: Frame N5u with posts 5 and 6, and medallion featuring a young bearded man.

Fig 82. Church of St Cross: Frame N6u with posts 6 and 7, and medallion featuring a second young bearded man, scale 200mm.

Fig 83. Church of St Cross: Frame S1u with posts 8 and 9, and medallion of a woman.

Fig 84. Church of St Cross: Frame S2u with posts 9 and 10, with medallion of an older man with a ribbon in his hair.

Fig 85. Church of St Cross: Frame S3u with posts 10 and 11, with medallion of a woman.

Fig 86. Church of St Cross: Frame S4u with posts 11 and 12, with medallion of a man.

Fig 87. Church of St Cross: Frame S5u with posts 12 and 13, with medallion of a man.

Fig 88. Church of St Cross: Frame S6u with posts 13 and 14, and medallion featuring a second pelican vulning, Fox's badge.

Fig 127. Sibyls illustrated in Barbieri's book and in a Book of Hours by Laval.

Fig 128. Gaillon: stone carving by unknown hand of the Tiburtine sibyl, original location unknown and now in the stone store at Gaillon. (from Buckard and Chirol 1980).

Fig 129. St Denis, Paris: Gaillon stalls, G2 panels, showing the sibyl Hellepontica in N1 and sibyl Tiburtine in S4.

Fig 130. St Denis, Paris: Gaillon stalls, G2 panels, showing Delphic sibyl in N6 and Persian sibyl in S2.

Fig 131. Church of St Cross Hospital: detail of sibyl showing face and side view.

Fig 132. Ugborough church, Devon: sibyls painted on panels in the choir screen and framed with Renaissance detail.

Fig 133. Silkstede frieze, Winchester Cathedral: bay 5 showing horned dolphins with a central urn.

Fig 134. Layer Marney church, 1st Lord Marney's tomb: detail of the terracotta canopy above the tomb showing horned dolphins with urns.

Fig 135. St Denis, Paris: Gaillon stalls, N6 showing marquetry in seat where putti are seated on volutes and hold between them a plaque, the volutes swirl out to engage the full-face masks.

Fig 136. St Denis, Paris: Gaillon stalls, misericord with putti.

Fig 137. St Denis, Paris: Gaillon stalls, detail of seat back panel showing horned birds pecking at masks with linking volutes.

Fig 138. Church of the Hospital of St Cross: frame N3b.

Fig 139. An engraving by Giovanni Pietro da Birago and *cloiture* work in the Gaillon stalls.

Fig 140. Winchester Cathedral: junction between the presbytery arcade and the south transept north wall showing the over-run of Bishop Fox's window arcade in preparation for the replacement of the transept fenestration.

Fig 141. Panels from Gaillon, St Cross and Silkstede's stalls to show quality of execution of carving.

Fig 142. Winchester cathedral, Silkstede's chapel, view from east into the south transept as drawn and engraved by John Le Keux *c.*1830, published in Carter 1830. This view shows the 'temporary' roof timbers in the south transept west aisle roof and the crest across the front of Silkstede's

chapel and above (?) his frieze. Silkstede's stalls are visible through the tracery of the screen.

Fig 143. Silkstede's chest, now in the church of St Blasius, Isle of Wight. Two nineteenth century engravings: from Shaw and Meyrick 1836 and Stone 1890, showing the two script forms on the chest and demonstrating some of the perils in relying on antiquarian prints.

Fig 144. Winchester cathedral, south transept, west face of screen to Silkstede's chantry chapel, showing letters in string-course, the crest seen in the *c.*1830 print is now missing.

Fig 145. Winchester cathedral, south transept. Silkstede's stalls, the south range from the north showing the pilasters, frieze and linenfold panelling.

Figs 146, 147, 148, and 149. ....Winchester cathedral, Silkstede stalls: panels from the frieze. From top: (Fig 5) dolphin and urn design 1 and (Fig 6) design 2; (Fig 7) Silkstede's initials supported by dolphins; and (Fig 8) see arms supported by griffins.

Figs 150, 151, 152 and 153. Winchester cathedral, Silkstede's stalls: pilasters 4, 5, 6 and 7

Fig 154. Winchester Cathedral: monograms on the presbytery screen, bay S3S

Fig 155. Winchester Cathedral: vault over presbytery south aisle showing boss with Lisle sunburst badge.

Fig 156. Thruxton church: Lisle badge on church tower stringcourse.

Fig 157. Map showing location of Thomas Bertie's work.

Fig 158. East Tisted church: crest of a saracen's head above the Norton arms erected on top of the Norton memorial in the south aisle chapel.

Fig 159. Plan of the Winchester Cathedral showing the main features of the presbytery, location of the tombs and other details.

Fig 160. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: south screen general view.

Fig 161. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: north screen general view.

Fig 162. Pexall monument in Sherborne St John church, Hampshire.

Fig 163. Lisle monument in Thruxton church, Hampshire.

Fig 164. Draper chapel screen in Christchurch Priory, Hampshire.

Fig 165. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: south screen bay S3 from the south.

Fig 166. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: north screen bay N3 from the north.

Fig 167. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: north door from the north.

Fig 168. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: tomb of Earl Beorn and Count Richard in south screen.

Fig 169. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: detail of spandrels in tomb of Earl Beorn and Count Richard.

Fig 170. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: tomb of Nicholas of Ely in the south screen.

Fig 171. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: detail of spandrels in tomb of Nicholas of Ely.

Fig 172. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: tomb of Bishop Toclyve.

Fig 173. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: detail from tomb of bishop Toclyve.

Fig 174. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: tomb of Bishop Pontoise.

Fig 175. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: detail from tomb of Bishop Pontoise.

Fig 176. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: tomb of Bishop de Valence.

Fig 177. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: detail from tomb of Bishop de Valence.

Fig 178. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: tomb of Harthacnut.

Fig 179. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: detail from tomb of Harthacnut.

Fig 180. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: south face of tomb of Bishop Pontoise.

Fig 181. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: detail of the south face of tomb of Bishop Pontoise.

Fig 182. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: north door, detail of jamb.

Fig 183. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: north door showing detail of east spandrel.

Fig 184. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: north door showing detail of west spandrels.

Fig 185. Winchester Cathedral presbytery: south screen bay S1S west section,

Fig 206. Sherborne St John: Pexall monument, detail of frieze and frieze from Winchester Cathedral south presbytery frieze.

Fig 207. Sherborne St John: Pexall monument, tomb panels and inscription, north face.

Fig 208. Sherborne St John: Pexall monument, tomb panels and inscription, south face.

Fig 209. Sherborne St John: Pexall monument, the effigies of Ralph and Edith Pexall.

Fig 210. Sherborne St John: south porch.

Fig. 211 Sherborne St John: details from the south porch showing from top: the plaque with inscription in Roman lettering recording James and Jane Spyre's donation and below the right and left spandrels from the door case.

Fig. 212 Sherborne St John: south door showing plaque and donor panel framed with Renaissance detail.

Fig 213. Thruxton church: plan of the church (surveyed and drawn by Nicholas Riall).

Fig 214. Thruxton church: general view of the Lisle tomb and west arch from the south west.

Fig 215. Thruxton church: west arch spandrel showing shield on south east corner with Lisle sunburst device.

Fig 216. Thruxton church: west arch spandrel showing shield on south west corner with Lisle shield showing martlets.

Fig 217. Thruxton church: west arch spandrel showing shield on north east corner with ? and **L**, probably donor shield for John and Mary Lisle.

Fig 218. Thruxton church: west arch spandrel showing shield on north east corner with **M** and **I** probably donor shield for Mary and John Lisle, with a ? date that is now unreadable – note the Lisle sunburst device emerging from behind the shield.

Fig 219. Thruxton church: view of the Lisle monument and tomb from the south.

Fig 220. Thruxton church: detail of top south east corner of the monument showing spandrel, stringcourse, shield, helm, and frieze etc.

Fig 221. Thruxton church: detail of top south west corner of the monument

showing spandrel, stringcourse, shield, helm, and frieze etc.

Fig 222. Thruxton church: detail of south face jamb with Lisle motif.

Fig 223. Thruxton church: view of the Lisle monument and tomb from the south-west showing earlier tomb and Thomas Bertie's encasing work with mouldings.

Fig 224. Thruxton church: Lisle tomb, north face showing the *all'antica* work in the panels.

Fig 225. Thruxton church: Lisle tomb, north face showing the *all'antica* work in the panels – detail of central panel.

Fig 226. Thruxton church: Lisle tomb, north face showing the *all'antica* work in the panels – detail of left hand panel.

Fig 227. Thruxton church: Lisle tomb, north face showing the *all'antica* work in the panels – detail of right hand panel.

Fig 228. Thruxton church: Lisle tomb, the effigies of John and Mary Lisle.

Fig 229. Christchurch Priory: Prior Draper's chantry chapel screen from the west.

Fig 230. Christchurch Priory: Margaret Pole's chantry chapel screen.

Fig 231. Christchurch Priory: Draper chantry chapel, the frieze and inscription on the string-course.

Fig 232 Christchurch Priory: Draper chantry chapel, detail of frieze.

Fig 233. Christchurch Priory: Draper chantry chapel, detail of cornucopia with Draper's initials and sketch of the priory showing a spire.

Fig 234. Christchurch Priory: Draper chantry chapel, detail of cornucopia with Draper's initials.

Fig 235. Christchurch Priory: Draper chantry chapel, detail of the spandrels.

Fig 236. Christchurch Priory: Draper chantry chapel, southern window with *all'antica* work in the spandrels and transoms.

Fig 237. Christchurch Priory: Draper chantry chapel, detail of southern window transoms.

Fig 238. Christchurch Priory: Pole chantry showing detail of *all'antica* work in the transom.

Fig 239. East Tisted church: the Norton monument.

Fig 240. East Tisted church: the Norton monument, detail of left tomb panel.

Fig 241. East Tisted church: the Norton monument, detail of centre tomb panel.

Fig 242. East Tisted church: the Norton monument, detail of right tomb panel.

Fig 243. East Tisted church: the Norton monument, detail of Norton arms and putti above tomb canopy.

Fig 244. Basing church: Paulett tomb showing general view of style, design and layout.

Fig 245. Basing church: Paulett tomb showing detail of spandrel with strapwork around the Paulett arms.

Fig 246 Thruxton church: View of the church tower from the southeast.

Fig 247. Thruxton church: View of the church tower from the northeast.

Fig 248. Thruxton church: View of the church tower from the west.

Fig 249. Thruxton church: north side of the tower, showing shield with TL on the stringcourse and Thx1 type section of frieze.

Fig 250. Thruxton church: plaque with the date 1527 on the east face of the tower showing Thx5 type of frieze.

Fig 251. Thruxton church: frieze type Thx1 (section W2)

Fig 252. Thruxton church: frieze type Thx2 (section E2, E3 and E4) with Lisle arms of three lions above a bar on the stringcourse below.

Fig 253. Thruxton church: frieze type Thx3 (section S2), showing here sections S1-S4 and the Lisle arms of sunrays through clouds on a shield.

Fig 254. Thruxton church: frieze type Thx4 (sections S3-S5).

Fig 255. Thruxton church: frieze type Thx6 (sections E8 and E9) from the southeast [above] and from the northeast.

Fig 256. Thruxton church: detail of merlons and pinnacles, showing southwest corner of the tower.

Fig 257. Winchester Cathedral: mortuary chest in bay S3, from the south and detail of applied frieze.

Tables

Acknowledgements

I most grateful to the University of Wales Swansea for awarding me a postgraduate research studentship for 2002-05 thereby providing the financial support for the research of this dissertation. I have greatly benefited from the wise counsel of my supervisor, Dr John E Law, and I thank him for his encouragement and support in my work. My thanks also to Professor Stuart Clark and Dr Deborah Youngs who read and commented on sections of my draft text.

My interest in the early sixteenth-century Renaissance was sparked by the project that Dr Angela Smith suggested we undertake together at St Cross; to her my thanks for introducing me to such an absorbing and fascinating subject.

An enterprise such as this depends on the help and support of many people. I am most particularly grateful to The Master, brothers and porter at St Cross Hospital, Winchester, whose benevolence permitted the study of the frieze to begin in the first place; and to John Hardacre, curator of the collections at Winchester Cathedral, who provided access to areas normally inaccessible to the public, a ladder when most needed, and shared thoughts, ideas and opinions. I am very appreciative of the hospitality extended to me by Rachel Hunt (house manager for the National Trust at Cotehele), which enabled me to use Cotehele as a base to explore Renaissance woodwork in churches across Cornwall and Devon while also working on the Cotehele tester. My thanks also to Helen Paterson and Caz James who put me up while I explored terracotta in East Anglia.

My thanks also to Geoff Durnford, of Winchester Museums Service, for organising access to the Winchester College frieze and arranging permission for me to photograph it; Jonathan Foyle, lately curator at Hampton Court palace, who provided access to the terracotta from excavations at the palace and

permitted me to take photographs of it, and for his stream of emails discussing the minutiae of craftsmanship from European as well as English contexts – a correspondence that I hope has benefited us both; Christopher Green, now with St Albans Museums, who kindly gave me a copy of his unpublished dissertation on terracotta from Suffolk Place, and explored thoughts about terracotta with me; The Reverend I. Hamilton at St Andrews, Sherborne St John, who lent me the church keys and left me to my own devices when I photographed and recorded the Pexall monument; Alison Hills, registrar of the Sutton Place Foundation at Sutton Place for her assistance in gaining access for me to photograph the building and take measurements; Karen Laverick, house manager for the National Trust at The Vyne, Hampshire, for arranging access and permission to photograph the glass in the chapel and the Probus medallion; The Reverend Ann McKenzie at St Peter and St Paul, Thruxton who gave me 'out of hours' access to the church and photocopies of archival material relating to the Lisle monument and chapel; Rebecca Naylor at the Victoria and Albert Museum who provided access to the V&A store and secured permission for me to photograph Renaissance woodwork in the V&A collections; Graham Pollard of Cambridge, for his extensive comments on Renaissance medals and his thoughts on the Gaillon and St Cross medallions; Richard the verger at Christchurch Priory who unlocked doors and provided access to the chantry chapels in the priory; Terry Smith, of the Museum of London Archaeological Service, who discussed terracotta with me at length and provided a pre-publication copy of his work on the Clerkenwell material; I am especially grateful to Robert Yorke, Archivist of the College of Heralds, for giving me his time to answer my questions concerning the episcopal heraldry of the see of Winchester.

Contrary to Simon Jenkins's lament in his 1999 book, *England's Thousand Best Churches*, I have found that most churches in England and Wales have tended to be open. And that where they are locked to the casual visitor, doors

are soon opened on application to the local vicar or key-holder; these often grey-haired ladies who have much wisdom to impart even when one is hopping from one foot to the other and anxious to move on to the next church, on what seemed always to be a long list that usually made for a busy day's work.

In France: I am indebted to Maria-Anne Privat-Savigny at the Musée de la Renaissance at Ecouen, Paris for her help in accessing archival material relating to Gaillon and providing photocopies of photographs and drawings of the Gaillon boiseries; to Bertrand the concierge at St Denis, Paris, for his help with photographing the Gaillon stalls; the guides and staff in particular at Amboise, Beauvais, Blois, Chambord, Chartres, Evreux, Gaillon (in 2000), Rouen, and Tours.

I am deeply grateful to the librarians at many institutions for their help and assistance without which the work for the dissertation would have been incomparably more difficult, especially so those at the University of Wales at Swansea, and those at the British Library, the University of Wales Cardiff, the central library Cardiff, the staff of the National Monuments Record in Swindon and those at the National Archives, Kew. Also, the staff of the Hampshire Record Office (where all the historical and other records from St Cross are now to be found), the local history library in Basingstoke and especially those in the central library of Winchester, the headquarters library (of the Hampshire library service) in Winchester, and the library of the Winchester City Museums.

And finally, I must express my deep appreciation to my wife Debbie who has been my constant and steadfast companion on this journey, content to endure grey, rain lashed days exploring chilly English churches with the same enthusiasm as hot, languid days in Italy and France.

Abbreviations

In order to define and be able to cross-compare individual components from each site discussed in the text I have utilised a system of alpha-numeric numbering that I have devised myself or have adapted from existing publications. Within each chapter individual numbered elements should be understood to relate to the site under discussion but on occasion these sites have to be referred to in other chapters and I have therefore used archaeological short-hand code to define these sites. The codes are as follows:

G	Gaillon (G1-G14 being elements of the Gaillon stalls)
ChX	Christchurch priory
SStJ	Sherborne St John (Pexall monument)
MC	Morning Chapel in the church of St Cross
StX	St Cross
Thx	Thruxton (Lisle monument, with the tower frieze D1-D7).
WCath	Winchester cathedral
WCath bay S1S	indicates the presbytery south screen, bay number and face (here S1S = south, bay 1, south face)
WCath bay N1N	as last but north screen (north, bay 1, north face)

For abbreviations connected to references in the footnotes, see the opening page of the bibliography.

Bringing the Renaissance to Tudor England:

The role of Richard Fox and his frieze at St Cross, Winchester

Nicholas Riall

Chapter 1:

Introduction

DURING THE FIRST DECADE of Henry VIII's reign, a new art form arrived in southern England – *all'antica*. This Renaissance style, to put it at its most simple, was a fashion for covering otherwise conservative, Gothic, forms with decorative ornament based on a selection of motifs drawn from Classical objects such as monumental arches and sarcophagi. The precise date at which this happened remains an elusive, even controversial topic and depends rather on personal views as to whether individual objects or architectural structures should be considered as the *prima facie* evidence for the introduction of the new style, but a date of *c.*1520 is generally understood to be a reasonable assessment. An early, and arguably outstanding, example of this new style was the creation of a suite of stalls in the church of the Hospital of St Cross in Winchester.

A mutual fascination for individual bishops of Winchester led, in the summer of 1999, to Angela Smith and me undertaking a survey of the *all'antica* frieze at the Hospital of St Cross England (hereafter the Smith and Riall survey).[1] It soon

[1] My interest was in Bishop Henry de Blois (bishop 1129-71) who was the subject of my BA dissertation; this formed the basis of my shorter study of his life and art patronage, Riall 1994. Angela Smith's interest was in Bishop Richard Fox (bishop 1501-28) who she studied at the Warburg Institute, London; see Smith 1988a, *The Life and Building Activity of*

became apparent that the frieze at St Cross hardly featured in any academic survey, and that outside some later nineteenth-century and early twentieth-century specialist literature, the frieze had not been included in any survey of Renaissance work in England since 1952.[2] A major survey of early Renaissance work in the nearby Winchester Cathedral was undertaken by Martin Biddle and published in 1993.[3] This was a wholly inclusive survey, with little reference to work outside the cathedral and St Cross was not mentioned. However, both Biddle, and an earlier exploration of the Renaissance aspects of the cathedral by Anthony Blunt,[4] mentioned a strong stylistic connection to Gaillon, the château of Cardinal Georges d'Amboise that was rebuilt in the years 1502-1510 with a strong element of the first Franco-Italian Renaissance style.[5]

Angela Smith and I decided to stop researching the frieze in the summer of 2001 and to write up our findings as an academic paper. The Society of Antiquaries of London published our paper detailing these findings in 2002.[6] Our paper described the frieze, assigned its patronage to Bishop Fox, established that the frieze was part of a wider suite of work that included canopied benches and desks, and suggested the work should be dated to 1517. We also discussed the questions of who designed the work and who carved it, problems that we found it difficult to agree upon. Dr Smith favoured Bishop Fox's master carpenter, Humphrey Coke and this is whom we credited with the work but I was not so sure then and, in the light of my further work, I believe we were incorrect to assert this. I also believe we were wrong to suggest that Coke contracted the work out to Flemish carvers who might have

Richard Fox, c1447-1528, unpubl. PhD thesis, University of London. Smith has a short life of Bishop Fox in preparation.

2 Kenneth Harrison, 1952, 29, where he dates the 'screen' to *c.*1525. Harrison mentions Renaissance-styled work only at Christchurch Priory, St Cross and The Vyne in Hampshire, he makes no mention of work in Winchester Cathedral. It should be noted that Harrison simply noted the presence of Renaissance work at each of these places and he did not attempt to describe it in any detail.

3 Biddle 1993.

4 Blunt 1969, 17-29.

5 I visited Gaillon in August 2000 when the castle was opened to the public as part of the French celebration of the Millennium. A major project of restoration by the French state has been underway at Gaillon for many years and this was the first time the building had been opened to the public. The château is once more closed and permission to gain access has proved to be very difficult.

6 Smith and Riall 2002, 125-156.

previously worked on royal commissions such as the stalls in the Henry VII Chapel at Westminster Abbey. In the course of our survey, we recognised that the frieze, stalls and desks all belonged together, but we were not then able to achieve a reconstruction of the original layout of the whole suite of work. Lastly, we did not place the work at St Cross into the wider context of *all'antica* work in either Hampshire or southern England, because our primary aim was to achieve a survey of the frieze itself and, secondly, owing to constraints on our time and the limitations of publication space.

In the months before starting my research at the University of Wales at Swansea, I decided to take a detailed look at a frieze associated with some stalls that stand in the south transept of Winchester Cathedral and which were created through the patronage of Prior Silkstede sometime before 1524, the year of his death.[7] This work had previously been examined in Biddle's 1993 survey, but my re-evaluation of his comments was predicated on the view that the design ideas of Silkstede's stalls were based on the frieze at St Cross, an aspect he had not considered. An important facet of this was the recognition that horned creatures, mostly dolphins, were a particular characteristic of both these works, appearing also amongst the dolphins in Silkstede's frieze. This was something Biddle had not noticed, indeed he thought the dolphins were actually birds. It was during my first visit to St Denis in Paris that I noticed this strange, one might even call it bizarre, affectation – to place horns on creatures that clearly could never had such physical characteristics in the natural world.[8] This was peculiar, even by the standards of Renaissance fantastical carvings expressed through *all'antica* ornament. Was this a defining characteristic and could it be that by exploring where this feature occurred we might have a tool that would potentially link one work with another? An early task therefore was to establish the spread of horned creatures not only in England but also in France, and additionally to see if it was possible to trace this motif back to an Italian original.

7 This was published as Riall 2003b, (copy on figures DVD); and see below Chapter 10, pp.246 ff..

8 Through one of the quirks of good fortune, I visited St Cross at the behest of Angela Smith in early September 1999 and a week later went off on a long-planned holiday based in Paris from where I intended to visit a number of cathedrals including Reims, Chartres and the basilica of St Denis on the northern outskirts of Paris, where of course I saw the stalls from Gaillon and was quickly smitten by how very similar they looked to the work at St Cross.

The necessity to set St Cross into its wider context formed one of the first prerequisites of my research for this dissertation and to that end I have explored cathedrals, churches, palaces, houses and museums across England seeking examples of *all'antica* work. The main result of this fieldwork was to show that there is nothing in England that is quite like the frieze at St Cross. No other surviving work contains a group of medallions supported by a wealth of fantastic creatures and Renaissance motifs in such an effusion of carving. The frieze at St Cross can justifiably be described as unique in an English context. Its closest parallel is the suite of stalls carved for the chapel at Gaillon through the patronage of Cardinal Amboise. These stalls are also without compare; there is nothing else like them in France.

While examining the Silkstede frieze in minute detail, cross comparing each and every panel, one with the next and with all, I realised that the quality of the carving of this work was considerably inferior to that of the frieze at St Cross. It was evident that whoever had carved the St Cross work could not have carved the Silkstede frieze. Further, my wide-ranging travels seeking *all'antica* work across England had failed to reveal another work that might have been carved by whoever had carved the St Cross frieze. However, some of the motifs did re-appear elsewhere, for example amongst terracotta mouldings for window frames at Hampton Court and Sutton Place, and amongst the terracotta panels used to create funereal monuments across East Anglia – a particular feature being the appearance amongst these terracotta panels of horned creatures. But, apart from Silkstede's frieze, none of the motifs from the St Cross work appeared in another Hampshire setting until after 1535.

There was however a different trail of evolution that could be followed, one that was quite slight but nonetheless one that was faintly discernible, and one that I thought might, with more fieldwork, become more positive. Biddle had already established part of this evolution by linking motifs in Silkstede's stalls with work in the Winchester Cathedral presbytery screens; nevertheless, he concluded that there was no link between the two friezes set above the presbytery screen arcades.[9] I was certain that Biddle's analysis was fundamentally flawed owing to the lack of reference to work outside the cathedral. I have noted the frieze at St Cross but

[9] Biddle 1993, 271-74; and see Chapter 12, pp. 278 ff..

mention should be made also of the Draper chantry screen in Christchurch Priory and the Lisle monument in Thruxton church, both of which I had seen early in the Smith and Riall survey of St Cross. There seemed to me to be more here than had been understood or fully analysed. Additional fieldwork in Hampshire revealed two more funereal monuments and I contend that these, taken together, are of vital importance in understanding the development of the cathedral presbytery screens. It became clear that Biddle's conclusions were potentially incorrect, that the two cathedral presbytery screen friezes were in fact ineluctably associated. In the process of studying the individual design elements, it became apparent that there was a sense of unity that bonded all these sites together. Thus, far from being a hotchpotch of unrelated work, the collection of *all'antica* work assembled in the presbytery of Winchester Cathedral was probably the result of a single artist's, or mason's, artistic and aesthetic development. This man was Thomas Bertie and I shall have more to say about him later.

An early problem that arose during the Smith and Riall survey was to do with the transmission of style. Smith suggested prints and other art materials, such as paintings, provided suitable media for the transmission of style. The problem, as I saw it, was that prints very rarely provide an image that corresponds in detail with a carving based upon it. While cross comparing the motifs present in the Gaillon and St Cross suites of work, it became apparent that there was a high level of correspondence between the two sets of work. Large numbers of tiny details had been carried over from the Gaillon work into the St Cross frieze, alongside larger design ideas that embraced the overall design of complete panels and underpinned the themes present in whole sections of the frieze. Combined with the failure to discover a close analogue of the St Cross frieze in England, this seemed remarkable. In order to attempt to resolve the problem, I decided that I would need to create an exhaustive catalogue of highly detailed images of every element of the work I examined, in order to establish a full visual record of all the motifs present in individual works. My reasoning was that there was a potential typological evolution of the display and definition of individual motifs, the idea being that if a typological series could be established from this evolution then it should be possible to establish

a dated sequence of work. The advent of digital cameras, used in conjunction with personal computers, has made such an aspiration possible.

With a background of employment as a field archaeologist over many years, I used the archaeological tools of stratigraphy and typology to reduce the *all'antica* work I examined to its basic motif units to establish a working typology of these motifs, to which I was then able to apply either specific dates or, as more often, a date range. It was through using these tools that I felt able to challenge some of the wider assumptions concerning the application of *all'antica* work. Thus for example, the suggestion that the tombs and buildings created with terracotta architectural units across East Anglia were the work of a single group of craftsmen which, I can now show, is incorrect;[10] and to refocus ideas on dating these works that has hitherto been difficult to place securely within a sequential framework.

The central aim of this dissertation is to show that the St Cross frieze is one of the earliest works executed in the *all'antica* style in England, and that the frieze underpins a stylistic development of the style that can be seen in a series of closely connected works, each a development of the last. This sequence runs from the frieze at St Cross, through the frieze and stalls for Silkstede, and onwards but modified into the tombs in the north presbytery screen in Winchester Cathedral. By positing the possibility that the presbytery screen friezes should be seen as part of a wider group of work, I then show that the south presbytery screen frieze parallels a frieze at Sherborne St John, part of the monument for Edith and Ralph Pexall. Nevertheless, which is the earlier? It is impossible to be certain but I think the Pexall monument might be the first in this sequence. The Pexall tomb is cased with panels that match those in the north presbytery frieze and, importantly, those in the tombs for the Lisles at Thruxton and the Nortons at East Tisted. The Lisle tomb has a frieze that parallels almost exactly those in the north presbytery screen and the Draper chantry screen at Christchurch Priory. This combination of work inescapably links the south frieze to the north frieze in the cathedral presbytery. Moreover, there is at Thruxton a second frieze. This was originally erected above the windows of the chapel that enclosed the Lisle monument, but was taken down in the eighteenth

10 This is the conclusion reached by John Blatchly, see Blatchly and Middleton-Stewart 2002, 123-48. On the terracotta tombs in general, see Baggs 1968, whose work has yet to be superseded.

century, with the materials reused to build a new church tower. This chapel frieze harks back to the St Cross and Silkstede friezes, but contains also more than a hint of the work exhibited on the Pole chantry chapel and which is also in Christchurch Priory.[11] Thus the chronology of work appears to lead from the Pexall monument back to the cathedral south screen; next comes the north door in the cathedral presbytery screen, followed the frieze above. Following this, or perhaps even contemporaneously, came the Lisle monument although it could perhaps be argued that the Lisle chapel, which was built to enclose it, pre-dates the tomb. This sequence reveals that the medallions and fantastic creatures that were a fundamental part of the St Cross-Silkstede friezes largely fell out of fashion in Hampshire, whereas in East Anglia fantastic creatures, including some with horns, remained in vogue until at least the 1530s. Additionally, in Hampshire the use of putti as a decorative motif also largely disappeared, only to return also in the 1530s amongst the tombs across Sussex including those at Broadwater, Boxgrove, Petworth, and Racton.

Documentary evidence shows the Lisle tomb was built after 1524, but that the chapel may well by then have been in existence. However, this is virtually the only documentary evidence available for any of this work – the building accounts for the work in the cathedral have been lost. Three of the screens have dates inscribed upon them, 1525 on the two cathedral screens but which are almost certainly ambiguous, and the date 1529 on the Draper chantry screen. There are moreover no documentary records for the frieze and stalls at St Cross. By contrast, the work at Gaillon is supported by considerable documentation; I will describe this below in connection with Cardinal d'Amboise and his château at Gaillon.

Are these pieces important? For Christopher Wilson the fascination for them is akin to 'stamp collecting'.[12] By this he presumably meant that in order to support a case for the early introduction of Renaissance work into England, advocates for the case such as myself have to 'collect' pieces of evidence much as we might collect

11 Christchurch Priory contains not only the two chantry chapels, for Draper and Pole, but also two sets of *all'antica* work within the treatment of the choir stalls where the carving of the dossers offers a contrast, and probably suggests both different carvers and dates, to the work on the desk ends which is more in line with the early Franco-Italian style as seen at Gaillon and Rouen.

12 This idea was expressed to me in an exchange of email correspondence between Professor Wilson and myself in January 2004.

stamps. I would aver that of themselves, the pieces are relatively insignificant but in their context, and of their time, they reflect something of the mindset that commissioned them. Here then a thought we might with profit remember – however tasteless some of these settings may appear to us today, in their time they were decidedly *à la mode*, or, in the parlance of today, 'very now'. We can also reflect on Anthony Blunt's comment concerning the French in Italy; he observed that they would have found the buildings of fifteenth-century Renaissance Italy 'merely bleak'.[13] Nonetheless, the French were most definitely attracted by the idea of *all'antica* ornament applied to architectural surfaces.

The French were no more ready for classical architecture in the early 1500s than were the English in the 1510s and 1520s. While there may not have been a profound shift in architectural practice, there certainly was in the use and application of the decorative arts, and these in turn brought with them changes to the style of architectural settings even if the basic form remained essentially Gothic. A clear example of this change can be seen in the funerary monument that Sir John Lisle commissioned for himself to be built in the church on his manor at Thruxton. He would have had a very clear idea of what he and his wife wanted and how those expectations would be fulfilled, and how the religious functions would be observed. These would not, indeed could not, have differed at all from the desires of his immediate forebears. Thus the setting of his tomb within the church, its placement, the general 'feel' of the tomb (it is a chest tomb) are all in keeping with what went before. The change is in the style of the decoration. This is radically different and pervades all areas of the tomb, right down to detailing on the armour. "Purpose" remains unchanged but "Style" has moved on, just as it did in the later twelfth century when Gothic supplanted Romanesque; and there is a wonderful irony here, since one of the earliest Gothic buildings in England – St Cross – houses one of the first examples of Renaissance work in England.[14]

The corpus of work from the cathedral, and from settings across Hampshire can, when taken together, be used to reveal a strong sense of a style that was 'in-

13 Blunt 1973, 16.

14 What is widely recognised as the first Renaissance work in England are the tombs created by Pietro Torrigiano in Henry VII's chapel in Westminster Abbey; on these tombs, see Higgins 1894; Lindley 1991; and Lindley 1997.

fashion' even if this lasted for only a short period. I would suggest that by *c.*1535 the fashion for *all'antica* work faded away, apart from a late surge of popularity for the style in southwestern England, where it was extensively used in decorative schemes on church screens and bench ends. What is more surprising is that there are consistent and determined attempts to deny the validity of the style. This was exemplified in the 2003-04 *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547* exhibition at the Victoria and Albert Museum, London.[15] The very word 'Renaissance' seemed to have been censored from both the exhibition catalogue and the exhibition itself, even though the opening exhibits were actually Renaissance in style and content. Why do academics wish to excise the early Tudor Renaissance? We might just as well attempt to suggest that art nouveau or art deco were non-existent, or of little importance, or that Charles Rennie Mackintosh was other than influential.

* * *

This thesis is divided into three sections each of which covers a general theme or topic. The first section covers the two main figures associated with the Gaillon and St Cross stalls, Georges d'Amboise and Richard Fox. The second section explores the introduction of Renaissance work to Winchester and looks in detail at work in the cathedral and at St Cross. The last section examines a series of stone-carved works from Winchester cathedral and around Hampshire, all of which I believe to have been the work of Thomas Bertie.

If we are to fully understand the artistic inspiration which produced the frieze at St Cross then the enquiry has to begin with discussion of the Gaillon stalls, and this forms Chapter 2. The Cardinal-Archbishop of Rouen, Georges d'Amboise along with his spectacularly fantastic château at Gaillon and sumptuous choir stalls,

15 For the exhibition catalogue, see Marks and Williamson 2003; and see my review of the exhibition, Riall 2004 (copy on figures DVD).

do not feature in any serious discussion of the early Renaissance in England. However, George d'Amboise himself was the subject of a doctoral dissertation undertaken by Elaine Yu-Ling Liou, in which she also explores the rebuilding of Gaillon and the outfitting of the chapel.[16] That said, Liou did not provide a detailed description and analysis of the Gaillon stalls.[17] I have used Liou's thesis to provide a vehicle for my own study, which takes into account my own extensive fieldwork in and around Rouen, as well as in Paris.

In Chapter 3, I explore the arrival of the *all'antica* style in southern England and the historiography of academic responses as to how this process should be viewed. I also examine the approaches that have been made to understanding the dissemination of the style and how there have been a number of surprising *lacunae* in these studies. The Smith and Riall survey of St Cross had shown that the frieze had somehow been 'lost' from any modern study of the early Tudor Renaissance. Thus it was most unexpected to find that three further settings – the Pexall, Lisle and Norton monuments – had similarly been neglected. One of the problems that I will highlight is that national surveys have tended to ignore the earlier Tudor period, most ending in the 1480s or starting in the 1530s, leaving the intervening period but poorly covered, which offers a partial explanation as to why the monuments mentioned above had seemingly been lost to view.

The frieze at St Cross is not simply an artefact to be dissected and analysed for its own intrinsic qualities, but was closely associated with the ambitions and religious aspirations of its patron, Bishop Richard Fox. I examine his life and patronage of the arts in Chapter 4, placing particular emphasis on his utilisation of Renaissance work. One of the larger problems to be resolved, if possible, was why he chose to build or ornament anything decorated in the *all'antica* style; a problem that is compounded by the fact that only a very little of his patronage actually incorporated *all'antica* work, which might suggest that he was not especially attracted to the style.

16 Liou, E Y-L 1997, *Cardinal Georges D'Amboise and the Château de Gaillon at the Dawn of the French Renaissance*, unpubl. PhD Thesis, Pennsylvania State University.

17 Her supervisor, Professor Elizabeth Bradford Smith at Pennsylvania State University tells me she has lost contact with Elaine Liou, but insofar as anyone is aware, Dr Liou has not thus far published anything of her thesis.

Anthony Blunt suggested that the earliest work in Winchester Cathedral potentially dated from the 1510s. I explore this suggestion in Chapter 5, where I challenge some of the attributions of style to a development of *all'antica* based on Gaillon originals. Chapter 6 examines in detail the suite of work at St Cross, explores the processes through which the suite was dismantled, dispersed around the church and then mostly re-assembled back in the church's chancel. I present here a fully articulated description of every component of the frieze, how each relates to the composite whole, with every part of the work supported by individual frame photographs. The whole is inevitably the sum of the parts, but if we do not understand, and accurately portray, the parts then it is to be expected that we will not be able to see the place of the singular in the wider context of the totality. Thus, for example, it becomes possible to link the St Cross work to pieces in Rouen because of very minor traits in the carving style, such as the suspension of candelabra from specifically designed hooks and tags. The problem of how the frieze was originally arranged is also addressed here, and a possible solution is offered. I also examine the question of patronage and conclude that the frieze was the result of the patronage of Bishop Fox alone, and that John Claymond (Fox's friend and the President of Corpus Christi, the college Fox founded at Oxford) cannot have been involved.[18] The next three chapters examine other aspects of the frieze, including the presence of sybils and the inter-connections between the St Cross work and the Gaillon stalls. This section of the dissertation concludes with an examination of Prior Silkstede's stalls in Winchester Cathedral.

John Harvey gave much weight to the idea that Thomas Bertie was the mason-builder deeply involved with work for Bishop Fox in Winchester Cathedral.[19] This built on documentary evidence published in the later nineteenth century linking Bertie to the cathedral, and to building works along the south coast in the 1530s including the series of artillery forts commissioned by Henry VIII. Harvey surmised that Bertie was also responsible for creating the cathedral presbytery screens, along with the Draper and Pole chantry chapels at Christchurch. However, he believed that foreign carvers were responsible for the creation of the *all'antica*

18 This contradicts Smith and Riall 2002, 145.

19 Hervey 1984; his *English Medieval Architects* first appeared in 1954. Harvey referred to the mason as Thomas Berty.

ornament. Harvey makes no mention of the Lisle, Norton and Pexall monuments, or of the chapels that enclosed them at Thruxton and Sherborne St John; all three were noted in the (earlier) Victoria County History of Hampshire – the Lisle and Pexall monuments even being illustrated in good photographs.

Martin Biddle, in describing some monograms on the south presbytery frieze, suggested they might be taken to indicate that this work could be more positively connected to Thomas Bertie. Unnoticed by any, although mentioned in the Victoria County History of Hampshire, was the will of Mary Lisle who died in 1524. This specified to her executors her desire that a tomb and chapel be built for herself and her husband stating, '... and cause to be made a Chapell or an ambulatory after the plott and bargayn made by my husbonde wt my lorde of Wynchestre's mason'.[20] Bertie is documented as living in Winchester in 1517, the year his son Richard was born, and again in 1520 but is not otherwise mentioned by name until 1532. There are quite simply no documentary records that record building works in the cathedral, or work for Bishop Fox elsewhere, that mentions Bertie by name. Nor is anyone else mentioned as the bishop's mason in Winchester. It is nevertheless my contention that it is probably correct to identify Thomas Bertie as both the bishop's mason and the author of these works, in both the cathedral and elsewhere in Hampshire, all of which was decorated with *all'antica* ornament. I further contend that I can see no reason why Bertie should have not carved all of the work himself, or worked on it with others in a workshop that was presumably based somewhere adjacent to the cathedral. Chapters 11, 12 and 13 explore Thomas Bertie's life and his work. I have again adopted the same principle of providing a high level of detail, backed by an extensive photographic record for these works. In many cases, this is the first time that these pieces have been examined and in this sense, these chapters can be seen as akin to archaeological reports. Here then is a further aspiration of this dissertation; to publicise hitherto neglected monuments and to present a detailed physical account of these pieces. It is my intention in due course to publish these works in the normal, accepted fashion.

Throughout my work, my analysis of the *all'antica* motifs has depended upon visual comparison. It is not my belief that size matters, nor for that matter does the

20 PROB 11/21 (formerly PCC, 27 Bodfelde); and see VCH Hampshire 4, 1911, 389, n.66.

quality of carving, or texture, or colour or material, all of which would be taken into account in a stricter archaeological typological analysis, such as I would have utilised with regard to medieval roof tile and tile kilns.[21] It is however true to say that certain materials and carving techniques have an important bearing on the rendition of these motifs. A better line of cut can generally be achieved in stone than in wood, but the precise type of stone or the quarry from which the stone originated can affect the final, finished quality of the carved work. Thus, the Caen stone that was used for the ambulatory screens at Fécamp permitted a much finer line than did the sandstone used at Forde Abbey or granite at Launceston. To an extent, this is also true with wood although comparison of the St Cross and Gaillon work, both in wood, shows a marked superiority of carving on the Gaillon work. A problem that I will highlight further below is that the openwork carving at St Cross denied the opportunity to the carvers to express a fine cut which the carvers at Gaillon were able to achieve because they carved their work in relief on plain boards.

There will be some who might argue that my work, especially in connection with Thomas Bertie, would have benefited from an analysis of the mouldings. While this would have certainly helped to link more firmly some of the architectural sections of the work together, such as the tracery of the windows and the profiles of the stringcourses, I suggest that the visual evidence is sufficient to enable a persuasive case to be argued. It should also be mentioned that for a moulding analysis to be fully effective many moulding profiles would have had to be drawn of other, contemporary, structures. This would have presented a heavily increased workload, so much so that it would probably not have been practical within the context of the present work, and, for *a priori* reasons, a selective or restricted sampling exercise of collating moulding profiles would not have been acceptable.

In the process of researching and writing this thesis I have visited, or so I believe, most of the sites where there is an example of *all'antica* work to be seen across southern England and East Anglia. I have additionally visited a number of sites in northern England and Scotland. I have also visited France on a number of occasions (twice to mutual terror of my wife and myself, taking a car to reach less accessible sites). I have visited many of the sites noted by Blunt in his still

21 On analysis of medieval roof tile, see Riall 1997 and Riall 2003a.

unsurpassed volume on French Renaissance architecture,[22] and also seen other sites and museum collections in and around Rouen, Caen, in Paris, along the Loire valley, and of course Gaillon itself. My one regret is that although I undertook two field trips through Italy, I never did find any horned dolphins there, although I was every bit as impressed by my first view of the Certosa di Pavia as were the French who arrived with Charles VIII during the French campaign in Italy of 1494-96.

This dissertation is arranged chronologically, which means that we will not arrive at St Cross until Chapter 6, but, if we are to make sense of the frieze and understand its origins, this enquiry must begin first with work in France. However, if discussion of Cardinal d'Amboise and his stallwork at Gaillon is to be relevant in this context, then it seems to me that it would be helpful to the reader to know something about the Renaissance frieze at St Cross first.

* * *

Long since recognised as one of the best examples of transitional Norman architecture in England, the church of the Hospital of St Cross possesses another treasure that has rarely been noticed – a Renaissance frieze.[23] It is best to choose a bright morning to visit this church, as the interior is very gloomy but, with the sun shining through the clerestory windows on a spring morning, the chancel is lit up and the Renaissance frieze shown to its best advantage. If you stand in the middle of the crossing looking into the chancel, you will see on either side a range of timber furnishings set between the westernmost pair of arches (figs 1 and 2); these are the remnants of the Renaissance frieze with its associated stallwork and desk. A little beyond, and flanked by the eastern pillars, are stone screens which were brought here sometime after 1507. I will have more to say about these stone screens later, but for now let us look at the wooden furnishings.

22 Blunt 1973.

23 I have chosen not to provide footnotes in this foreword as the frieze will be examined in close detail below, wherein the relevant references will be cited.

The sets of furnishings either side of the chancel are, almost, a mirror image of each other, save for the details of the carved work in each frieze. To the front stands a desk. This has linenfold panelling along its front; these panels are original but the end boards are of the nineteenth century. There is much graffiti on the desktop of the north desk, some of it dating from the 1570s. Behind the desk is a canopied bench with six plain panels set into its back, but if you were to look at the outside faces of these benches, adjacent to the pillars, you would find linenfold panelling similar to that in the desks.

Above the benches, but separate from it, is the frieze itself. It is soon apparent that the frieze is carved in a Renaissance-style and that there are many aspects of the work that convey a Classical feel. The frieze comprises a series of rectangular frames bounded by vertical posts (pilasters) and a central rail; the top rail is a modern introduction. The faces of the framework are covered with further carvings. The rails have water-leaf and egg-and-dart mouldings, while the pilasters have strings of candelabra filled with small motifs and these are capped with decorative capitals. Fitted into the framework are a series of panels that were made by butting together and gluing a set of planks that were then placed vertically in each frame.

The frieze was carved in openwork. This means that the carver cut completely through the planks of the frieze to leave open space amongst the carvings, thereby giving a vivid, three-dimensional feel to the work. The focal point of the frieze is a series of round medallions. These feature profile portraits, which are suspended from an ogee arch and set amongst a mass of carvings. This, on closer inspection, reveals a collection of creatures – dolphins, birds, putti and other motifs, positioned within individual frames of the frieze. Suspended from the bottom of the pilasters are a series of small figures, or corbel figurines, of men and women: these represent prophets and sibyls. Birds and dolphins (fig. 1) mostly support the medallions in the north frieze, while putti astride dolphins and dogs dominate those in the south frieze (fig. 2). These form the upper tiers of the work. The lower tiers offer different themes: that on the north shows putti set between birds and masks with cornucopia, while on the south are urns in between dolphins. If we look closely at the dolphins and the birds we notice that many have protrusions emerging from

their heads. These are horns and offer an important clue as to the origins of this work.

Walking round into the adjacent Morning Chapel, we find more of the frieze on the south wall (fig. 3). Arranged within a short length of framework is a jumble of carvings that are placed anyhow in the upper tier in a bewildering array of material, although it is clear it relates to the work in the chancel. By treating these four panels as a large jig-saw it is, as we shall see, possible to reconstruct many of the frames that have been lost from the frieze that extended north-south across the chancel, this being the now lost lateral range of the setting. The lower tier contains further small panels, but these show a different theme with urns, birds, cornucopia and winged putto heads, with four more corbel figurines.

On leaving this chapel, we should note the desks either side of the door. These have been cut down and may once have been just one desk, but of more interest are the dolphin terminals on the desktops. There are two more desks with similar terminals in the nave aisle and which together formed the remainder of furnishings that once furnished the chancel.

Were you able to stand on a ladder and look down on top of the canopied stalls, you would see the remains of the timberwork that once curved up and forwards above the stalls. This would have supported the frieze so that it would have been set up to hang just in front of and slightly above the stalls. Fortunately, there is a drawing that was made in 1818 which takes a cross section through the south stall and shows the frieze *in situ* (fig. 4), while others, made by John Carter in 1788, show the corbel figurines (fig. 5). He drew eighteen then and there remain still eighteen: nine men that are probably prophets with nine women that are sibyls, each clasping an attribute that allows us to identify them. Carter only drew these eighteen figurines, but his notes and sketches indicate there probably never were any more and this has implications for how the frieze can be reconstructed.

The medallions feature a collection of men and women, young and old, but this is an incomplete collection and we do not know who is represented here. It is possible they are heroes from antiquity or worthies, but they might have been great writers from antiquity and the medieval period. None show any trace of identification aside from one male in the north who wears a winged helmet, which

suggests a connection to Mercury and another male head in the south who has a ribbon in his hair and who might perhaps be Pliny or Virgil.

Amongst the broken pieces in the Morning Chapel are the remains of several shields. On these are the crossed sword and keys representing the episcopal arms for Winchester, and on others the vulning pelican that was Bishop Richard Fox's personal badge (fig. 3). This badge can also be seen on two of the medallions. These show that it was Fox who commissioned this frieze. We do not know when Fox had the work created, since there is no date carved on the work itself and there remains no documentary evidence to show who actually made it or what costs were involved. It may be that the frieze was created in 1517, in order to create a sumptuous setting amongst which were read the statutes for Fox's Oxford college of Corpus Christi, thus formally inaugurating his long-time and expensive project. Even if this were not quite correct, a date of between 1510 and 1520 would seem the most likely.

The frieze at St Cross seems to have survived relatively intact until about 1780-1800 when it began to disintegrate. Some attempt was made to patch it all up, and this involved the removal of the west, or lateral, range of the stallwork and frieze before the 1850s. A watercolour by W. Brough of 1858 shows the south stalls and frieze standing alone. In the 1860s the well-known Victorian architect, William Butterfield, was engaged to carry out a programme of conservation. In the process of his work, Butterfield removed Fox's stallwork in its entirety, the frieze was detached from the stalls and the whole mass of furnishings consigned to the Morning Chapel. It was during the first half of the twentieth century that first the frieze, and then the canopied benches and desks were returned to the chancel, and set out in the manner that we see them today.

Section One

Patronage and art: Amboise, Fox and a new style

Chapter 2:

Georges d'Amboise (1460-1510), Cardinal-Archbishop of Rouen: a patron of the Renaissance in the early sixteenth-century France

IN FEBRUARY 1508, a collection of massive packages arrived by ship at the Normandy port of Honfleur. Here they were offloaded onto a barge and shipped upstream to Rouen, where they were loaded onto wagons and taken the remainder of their journey by road. During the final stage of this journey, roads had to be re-surfaced or repaired, a new bridge built and the owners of fields compensated for the damage to crops caused by the passage of so bulky a shipment. On arrival, the various pieces took two months to assemble and, when it was done, the workmen involved were rewarded with a special ration of wine to celebrate their achievement.[1] This small episode speaks volumes for the prestige, power, wealth and patronage of the man for whom this work was undertaken – Georges d'Amboise. The package? A fountain that stood some two storeys high,[2] a gift to

[1] Dunlop, 1969, 49; Chirol 1952. 59-60; Liou 190-5. The expenses for erecting this fountain are shown in considerable detail in the 1508 Gaillon building account, on which see Deville 1850, 314-18. And see also Monique Chatenet in Arminjon 2004, 56.

[2] The fountain was presented to Cardinal d'Amboise by the Venetians. Drawings of the Cour d'Honneur at Gaillon, in which the fountain stood, suggest the fountain was two storeys or up to 25 feet high. The panels show armorial bearings of d'Amboise and Louis XII, with a centre panel showing St George.

enhance his château at Gaillon, from the city of Venice to a man who was recognised across Europe as the master of France.[3]

Introduction

Georges d'Amboise is worthy of study in the present context, as much for the position he held in his king's political affairs as for his patronage of the arts, both of which, as I shall show below, were paralleled by Bishop Richard Fox's career in England. Further, it was d'Amboise's patronage of Italianate decoration in architectural settings, and conspicuously so in the creation of a suite of chapel stalls, that appears to have provided the inspiration behind the decorative scheme of Fox's Renaissance frieze at St Cross; an important aspect of which are the striking parallels to be drawn between the two pieces of work. These can be exemplified by the similarity of the motifs employed and most notably by the presence of horned creatures – with the horned dolphins the most remarkable of these. The creatures are particular to these two pieces of work, with the only other known incidents of these motifs appearing either in work in Rouen,[4] or in later works in England that can arguably be seen as derivative of the frieze at St Cross.[5]

Cardinal d'Amboise was the central figure of a doctoral dissertation, by Elaine Liou;[6] a subject that had previously received little attention in the English language.[7] I do not propose to replicate Liou's work, but something must be said

3 The Venetian's diplomatic initiative evidently failed as by late 1508 a league comprising France, the empire, Spain, Hungary, several smaller Italian states and the papacy had been formed to attack Venice; see Baumgartner 1994, 192-7.

4 Horned dolphins appeared on a fireplace from a Rouennais nunnery now on display in the Musée des Céramiques, and appear on panelling beneath the organ in the church of St Maclou.

5 The two works in question are the Silkstede stalls in Winchester Cathedral, for which see below p. 250 ff., and their appearance amongst terracotta panels in tombs across East Anglia. My extensive fieldwork across England suggests that these are the only (surviving) exemplars of horned creatures associated with *all'antica* work of the early Tudor period.

6 Liou 1997.

7 For an exception see Blunt, 1973, 13-42, where Gaillon is explored in the wider context of the development of Renaissance architecture in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. This review of developments in France ignores anything that may have resulted from French incursions in Italy before 1499 and certainly over-simplifies the situation

about d'Amboise, and his fellow patrons of the Renaissance in early sixteenth-century France, if any discussion of their work is to make sense. More to the point, it is their connections with, and direct patronage of Italian artists that, I would argue, influenced the development of Renaissance arts in England in the first half of the sixteenth century.[8] Further to that, aside from Dr Liou's thesis, Gaillon has only ever been discussed in detail in French literature but a full analysis of the Gaillon stallwork or a close examination of the motifs and designs used in its creation has never yet appeared in print.[9] It is, therefore, my contention that if we are to understand the St Cross frieze we must begin with the work at Gaillon, which, as I shall show, pre-dates the St Cross frieze by perhaps as much as ten years although it is possible the two suites are closer in date. That this is important becomes clearer when we take note that the introduction of Renaissance work in England is generally reckoned to have occurred around 1520, a point I shall discuss in the next chapter.

The d'Amboise family.

When he died in 1476, Pierre d'Amboise was chamberlain to King Louis XI, governor of Touraine, provost of Blois and father to a large family of at least nine sons and eight daughters who, between them, came to occupy so many offices of state and church, that their power could be said to rival that of the kings of France. Georges (1460-1510), the subject of this chapter, was the eighth son and rose to become the cardinal-archbishop of Rouen and first minister to Louis XII.[10] His brothers all rose to high office: Charles, was governor of Bourgogne and

thereafter. Ward 1926, 19-22, described Gaillon but did not analyse the phases of construction or identify the role of the patron in its construction. Chastel 1995, 138-50 esp., provides an alternative view. The importance of Gaillon as an early Renaissance house was raised in Roberto Weiss's paper on Gaillon (Weiss 1953), but his work did not then prompt a wider enquiry in England.

8 Blunt, 1969, 17-29 outlined French influence on the development of Renaissance decoration in English architectural contexts, exceptionally failing to note the frieze at St Cross in the process, in an important discussion that remains thus far unchallenged or modified.

9 An observation that William Rieder made in 1977, see Rieder 1977, 355 n.20.

10 Geneviève Souchal provides a family tree in her paper on the Amboise family, Souchal 1976, fig. opp. p. 488; and see Liou 1997, xxvii. On Georges, see Souchal 1976, 578-88; she does not however discuss in any detail Georges's political career.

Champagne;[11] Jean (d.1498) was bishop and duke of Langres;[12] Aimery (1434-1512) was grand-master of the Order of the Knights Hospitaller and grand-prior of the Order in France;[13] Louis (d.1503) was bishop of Albi;[14] Pierre (*c.*1450-1505) was bishop of Poitiers;[15] while Jacques (*c.*1450-1516) became abbot of Cluny and bishop of Clermont.[16] The family's success continued into the next generation. The children of the eldest son, Charles, included Charles II (1473-1511) who was a grand master of France and, crucially, governor of Milan in the early 1500s,[17] while Louis II (1477-1517) became both a cardinal and bishop of Albi.[18] And finally we may note another Georges (1487-1550)[19] who succeeded his namesake uncle at Rouen as the cardinal-archbishop. By any measure this was a remarkable family.

* * *

In 1484 Georges was elected bishop of Montauban.[20] D'Amboise seems to have taken little part in the affairs of this episcopate; instead he became immersed in affairs at court where, in 1487, he was appointed a chaplain and counsellor to the seventeen-year old king, Charles VIII. In 1492 he became archbishop of Narbonne,[21] but, barely

11 Souchal 1976, 500-02.

12 *Ibid.*, 502-7; Jean also was a noted builder and patron of the arts, both at Langres and also at Dijon. His tomb, in the Cordeliers de Dijon, must have been carved in the following decade as it is filled with Renaissance imagery, see plate 3 in Souchal 1976.

13 *Ibid.*, 508-11.

14 *Ibid.*, 511-19; Louis was a closely involved with his brother Georges in Louis XII's government, he was also the patron of work at Albi cathedral including the choir vault and jube.

15 *Ibid*, 520-26

16 Jacques d'Amboise built the important early Renaissance house, Hôtel Cluny, in Paris; a brief description of this building is given in Thompson 1984. On Jacques, see Souchal 1976, 567-77.

17 *Ibid.*, 592-96.

18 *Ibid.*, 596-97.

19 *Ibid.*, 601-04; he became archbishop in 1510 but was not politically active like is famous uncle, remaining mostly within his own archdiocese. He continued the embellishment of the château at Gaillon, installing more glass, adding to the stallwork in the chapel and extending the buildings in and around the gardens. He also commissioned much building work in Rouen. It would also have fallen to Georges II to oversee the work of constructing his uncles tomb in the Chapel of the Virgin, in Rouen Cathedral.

20 Souchal 1976, 578.

21 *Ibid.*, 578; Liou 1997, 31.

a year later, the metropolitan see of Rouen fell vacant and it was to this archiepiscopal seat that he was transferred on 21 August 1494.[22]

War in Italy

Even as Georges d'Amboise was being elected archbishop,[23] he himself was in Lyons with Charles VIII plotting an invasion of Italy.[24] The plan was to seize the Aragonese throne of Naples, to which Charles had a claim.[25] There was no intention at this date to attack Milan, although Louis d'Orléans (later Louis XII) had a claim to the city and territory through his family connections to the Visconti, and this would enable him to attack Milan in his own reign.

The campaign against Naples was launched during September 1494. In February 1495, Charles VIII entered Naples at the head of his victorious army, his march through Italy a triumphal progress with hardly a battle fought. It is not entirely clear if Georges d'Amboise accompanied the army to Naples, but he was certainly in Genoa in late 1494, and at Novara in June 1495, when he was at Louis d'Orléans' side as the French swept into the city; thus it appears that d'Amboise was in Italy throughout the campaign.[26] Although the war itself had been a success, the French were unable to hold Naples, and by mid 1496 the French had been evicted.[27] The French enjoyed much greater success in the north where their presence, initially in Genoa but soon expanding across Lombardy, remained largely unchallenged until 1509, when Louis XII declared war on his erstwhile ally, Venice.

In many respects this was an epoch making episode, in part for the realisation that France had become a power to be reckoned with on the European stage. As important was the exposure of Italy, and all things Italian, to many

22 Souchal 1976, 579. Baumgartner, 1984, 89-90, points out that the then recently appointed Louis d'Orléans as governor of Normandy was probably influential in securing this position for his friend, Georges d'Amboise.

23 Liou 1997, 36 noted that when d'Amboise visited the city in 1499 the Rouennais gave him a triumphal reception, complete with fountains erected at road crossings that flowed day and night.

24 An over-view of French aspirations to Naples is given by Philippe Contamine in Arminjon *et al.* 2004, 8-21.

25 Liou 1997, 39-48.

26 *Ibid.*, 47-55.

27 *Ibid.*, 49.

Frenchmen, especially those holding positions of power and influence in both state and church.[28] The early full impact of this war upon France is difficult to gauge. One major guide to assessing this assimilation of Italian culture into France is through architecture. Portable objects such as paintings, miniatures, jewellery or ceramics are much harder to provenance, as these could have been brought to France by any number of means other than as war booty.[29] That Italy and Naples in particular, was plundered for its works of art is beyond dispute.[30] Even the great bronze doors of the Castello Nuovo, in Naples, were taken down and loaded onto a ship for transport to Marseilles. The ship never arrived but was attacked and the doors, used to protect the men defending the ship, sustained considerable damage from cannon shot.[31]

Another aspect of the same castle that made a great impression on French minds was the nature of the entire gateway, a reflection of the classical Roman triumphal arch and one that included life-sized statues of King Alphonso and his companions, all in armour, surrounded by putti with swags, and whole panoply of classical motifs (figs 6 and 7). Such a gate cannot have failed but to impress, and both Louis XII and George d'Amboise would later have gateway-entrances erected at their palaces that were on a similarly ostentatious scale complete with statuary,[32] though neither were as large, or as overtly ostentatious as that at Naples.

28 This impact is described by Jean Guillaume in Guillaume 2003, and see also his essay in Arminjon *et al.*2004.

29 Antonovics 1995, 320, notes a convoy of ships that brought spoils of war from Naples being loaded at Pisa and sailed to Lyons, thereafter being transported to Amboise by road. This included tapestries, carpets and hangings. We may wonder how much was actually of Italian manufacture or representative of Italian renaissance art, as the tapestries are quite likely to have been Flemish and the carpets, conceivably, Turkish or Asian. Charles VIII had anyway lost part, at least, of his plunder when his army was attacked at Fornovo on July 6 1496 by Gianfrancesco Gonzaga. Some of d'Amboise's vast collection of manuscripts and miniatures, noted Liou 1997, 61-2, may well have been plundered from Naples although he is known to have bought many from Frederico III of Naples in 1501; on these, see Gennaro Toscano in Arminjon et al 2004, 122-135.

30 Baumgartner 1994, 47-8, describing Charles's march back to northern Italy and the battle at Fornovo (6 July 1495), shows that the plunder was so vast that the convoy carrying it was attacked in preference to assaulting Charles's army.

31 The doors of the Castell Nuovo were eventually returned to Naples were they can now be seen in the museum galleries within the castle, complete with cannon-shot still lodged amongst the bronze ornament. Exact replicas, in a rather ghastly resin, now hang in place of the originals, pers. obs.

32 Louis XII had an equestrian statue of himself erected above the main entrance into the palace at Blois; d'Amboise inserted a statuary group, probably of pedestrian figures, above the south gateway at Gaillon.

D'Amboise, back in Rouen in January 1496, seems not then to have initiated any building campaigns that reflect anything of an Italian style,[33] nor, apparently, did anyone else save, perhaps, the king who began new works at Amboise and Blois, though it has to be said that later developments at both palaces swept away Charles VIII's work.[34] An exception to this is the probability that the Maréchal de Gié, who fought in Charles VIII's campaign in Italy, may well have incorporated elements of Italianate style in his new house, the Château de Verger, built between 1496-99.[35] What is certain is that Italianate gardens came into vogue at this time, complete with temples, grottoes and, above all, fountains and waterworks.[36]

Turning to Rouen, we find that Gothic architecture remained the style of choice, even if this had entered a new phase of fantasy, to become the Flamboyant Gothic. It was in this style that two buildings – the west front and Tour de Beurre of the cathedral and the Palais de Justice – both of which can be associated with d'Amboise, were constructed in Rouen.[37] At the same time, the reconstruction of the church of St Maclou was being carried out in a manner that would stretch even Flamboyant Gothic to its limits of fantasy and creativity.[38] This church stands close to d'Amboise's archiepiscopal palace in Rouen. This was also rebuilt in this period, though most of this work has since been replaced or remodelled, certainly nothing overtly Italianate can be seen here today.[39] At Gaillon, the summer palace of the

33 *Pace* Blunt 1976, 17, who intimates that Cardinal d'Estoutville included Italianate work at Gaillon; this appears to be based on a mis-identification of the decoration of the stair-turret of the north, d'Estoutville, range by Chirol; on which, Chirol 1952.

34 Surviving work from Louis XII's reign includes the south range complete with the grand entrance into the court of honour; this was constructed in the Flamboyant Gothic style although there are traces of renaissance detail and ideas, including the equestrian statue of Louis XII. On Blois, see Jean Guillaume in Guillaume 2003; and also Jean Guillaume in Arminjon *et al.*2004, 41-51.

35 Chastel 1995, 138. Le Verger was torn down, in the nineteenth-century, on the orders of Cardinal de Rohan who could not bear the idea that a commoner would occupy this aristocrat's house. And see also Monique Chatenet in Arminjon *et al.* 2004, 53-61.

36 On early Renaissance gardens in France, see Lesueur 1935, 90-117.

37 On the cathedral, see Aubert 1927, 11-71; the Palais de Justice is ascribed to the patronage of Georges d'Amboise by Thompson 1984.

38 Chastel 1995, 24, and 49 where he says he terms this style of Gothic work, "Hyper Gothic".

39 On the archiepiscopal palace see Jantzen 1989. Souchal 1976, 579 shows that it is possible d'Amboise introduced the Italian style into his palace in Rouen *c.*1502, and thus somewhat before it was introduced to the works at Gaillon. There appears to have also been an impressive fountain in the palace courtyard, as at Gaillon.

Rouennais archbishops, nothing much was happening at this time other than to maintain the then existing suite of buildings, the latest of which had been erected in the 1480s.[40]

Early Renaissance work in France

The sudden death of Charles VIII in April 1498 called for some adroit footwork on the part of Louis d'Orléans' advisors, with one principal problem being to arrange for the divorce of Louis from Jeanne de France, to be swiftly followed by his marriage to Charles's widow, Anne de Bretagne, in order that Brittany would remain in the hands of the French crown.[41] The negotiations for this delicate matter fell to Georges d'Amboise, and his success was capped with the presentation of a cardinal's hat, thereby demonstrably and publicly establishing d'Amboise as the first man after the king in France, even if this was a position he seems anyway to have occupied in the latter part of the previous reign.[42]

Before looking at the château of Gaillon, it should be noted that Georges d'Amboise was not necessarily the first patron of Renaissance work in France. Antoine de Bohier was another enthusiastic patron of Renaissance-styled work and it may well be that his patronage pre-dates that of Georges d'Amboise. Bohier was abbot of St Ouen (1492-1515), a monastery set in the northeast quarter of Rouen, and beside which Bohier had built a new abbot's lodgings in a mixture of Gothic and Renaissance styles.[43] He was also abbot of Fécamp (from 1505), as well as a prominent figure in the political affairs of Normandy.[44] Bohier visited Genoa in 1507,

40 On the earlier buildings at Gaillon, see Chirol 1952; and Gill 1992, 385-6. These are further discussed below.

41 Knecht 1996, 57.

42 Baumgartner 1994, 78.

43 These lodgings were destroyed in the nineteenth century, see Buckard *et al.*1980, 36-7. Bohier's lodgings were built in a mix of brick and stone that echoed the work at Blois and were complete with stonework detail over the windows and roofs in the flamboyant Gothic style.

44 His brother Thomas was Treasurer of Normandy and was responsible for erecting the Bureau des Finances, this stands across the square from the west front of Rouen Cathedral. It is a building that has two remarkable facades covered in *all'antica* ornament and which once boasted a number of medallions, now lost, supported by putti. The building was damaged by Allied bombing in the Second World War. Thomas Bohier was also responsible

where he probably met Girolamo Viscardi, from whom he commissioned a high altar. Did this altarpiece arrive before work began at Fécamp on the series of screens to the chapels that radiate off the ambulatory? Blunt observed that these screens were possibly carved by Italian craftsmen well before the abbot's death in 1519.[45] The abbey guidebook suggests a date of around 1499. My own observation of these screens suggests that their austerity and sparseness of style is far closer to original Italian styles than is the more evolved, over-ornate and complex style that was employed at Gaillon, and this suggests they might predate the Gaillon work. It should be noted too that the Fécamp screens were almost certainly created successively, probably over a number of years, rather than in one all-embracing campaign (figs 8 and 9). To the Italianate work at Fécamp, we may add the Palais de Congrès in Rouen (fig. 10). Allied bombing in 1944 largely destroyed this building, but sufficient remains to suggest that this predated the second French campaign in Italy, and perhaps echoed the style of d'Amboise's archiepiscopal palace.

While Bohier may have been the first to employ Renaissance detail in his architectural enterprises, aside that is from Charles VIII or Louis XII who perhaps utilised the style in their work at the royal palace at Blois, it is very likely that d'Amboise's large collection of manuscripts generated an interest in producing new manuscripts, in Rouen, that incorporated Renaissance motifs from soon after 1500.[46] Gennaro Toscano included an illustration of a miniature from Josephus's 'History of the Jews', dated to 1503, in his discussion of illuminated manuscripts for the summer 2004 exhibition catalogue of *De l'Italie à Chambord*.[47] This reveals a wide range of Renaissance motifs, including putti and dolphins although none with horns, which would be included in the range of work that appeared in later years at Gaillon. It was quite possibly manuscripts such as these that underlay the use of antique work

for the early, Italianate, phases of the château at Chenonceau, later extended and further embellished by Francis I.

45 Blunt, 1973, 18-20.

46 On these manuscripts, see Gennaro Toscano in Arminjon *et al* 2004, at 131-135 and esp. fig 13.

47 This summer exhibition was held at Chambord in 2004 and displayed a range of material illustrative of the early Renaissance in France including a number of sculptural works from Gaillon. The catalogue edited by Arminjon *et al* offers a series of excellent essays that explore the French invasions of Italy and the emergence of Renaissance work in France through to about 1530. There was curiously no reference to stained glass.

by Nicholas Castille in his carvings, in both Rouen and at Gaillon, and which predated the arrival of Italian artists to work at Gaillon. I will discuss this matter further below, but it is abundantly clear that there was available in Rouen the illustrative material upon which to base all'antica designs by 1503.

Louis XII in Italy

Louis and Georges d'Amboise had long worked together and for both men a principal interest was Italy.[48] Early in the new reign they resolved to attack Milan and a second Italian campaign began late in 1499. Within months the first objectives of the war, to capture Milan and defeat the Italian league, were achieved; Louis and Georges entered Milan in triumph on 6 October. It was a short-lived success. As soon as the French army moved away, Milan was recovered by Ludovico Sforza and Louis had to send d'Amboise back to retake the city and put in place effective control, alongside levying huge fines and the execution or banishment of leading members of Milanese society. Georges d'Amboise was named de facto ruler of the city by Louis XII, a role that was later handed over to Georges' nephew Charles d'Amboise when the Cardinal finally returned to France in the summer of 1503.[49]

A further expedition, to re-establish the French position in Naples, was planned for 1501 but this campaign petered out and was abandoned.[50] The French, however, remained very much in control of northwest Italy and especially Genoa and Milan, although here their presence was on occasion disrupted. Genoa, for example, revolted in 1507 and had to be subdued by a swift campaign; this providing an opportunity for Louis XII to celebrate a second victory, which was soon followed by a further triumphal entry, in full classical fashion, in a pageant said to have been designed by Leonardo da Vinci, into both Genoa and Milan.[51] This episode later provided a theme for ornamentation at Gaillon, where panels representing Louis XII's conquest of Genoa were sculpted by Antonio di Giusto

48 Baumgartner 1994, 105-18.

49 Knecht 1996, 59-62. Baumgartner 1994, 103, notes that Georges d'Amboise seems to have spent these years commuting backwards and forwards between France and Milan but gives no precise details of Amboise's travels.

50 Baumgartner 1994, 119-34.

51 *Ibid*, 186-7.

(Justi). Louis XII's Italian campaigns were further highlighted at Gaillon by another series of panels, these based on Mantegna's Triumph of Caesar, and which quite obviously were intended to reflect d'Amboise's own role in the war.[52]

It was perhaps during this second invasion of Italy that d'Amboise first saw the Certosa di Pavia and this building, along with others similarly decorated in the latest Lomabardic Renaissance style, may well have been a turning point in d'Amboise's architectural aspirations.[53] Blunt observed that the French would have been uninspired by the 'cold intellectualism of Florentine Quattrocento architecture' which, he believed, they would have found '... bleak'.[54]

From Georges d'Amboise's point of view, one of the key aspects of this campaign was the appointment of his nephew Charles as governor of Milan.[55] He apparently became a key-provider to his uncle of Italian sculptors, artists and craftsmen, as well as materials ranging from works of art, though engravings and wood-block prints to the raw materials including blocks of marble that would underline and underpin the redevelopment of Gaillon as a Renaissance château decorated and festooned in the latest Italianate style and cocooned within a fabulous garden created in the latest Italian taste (fig. 11).[56]

At this point it seems that Georges d'Amboise began to entertain serious hopes of becoming pope and, in 1503, came two elections (following the deaths of Alexander VI and Pius III), but he failed to be elected in either.[57] D'Amboise evidently recognised that it had now become unlikely he would ever accede to the papal throne,[58] and this failure prompted the onset of a massive campaign of re-building at Gaillon. This was the archiepiscopal summer residence on the Seine to the east of Rouen; although new building works had started at Gaillon as early as

52 Liou 1997, 47 and see also at p. 147.

53 Blunt 1973, 17 commented that Phillippe de Commines became 'ecstatic' when he saw (and wrote about) the Certosa. The west front continues to impress though we may also take note, as Blunt emphasises, of the profusion of terracotta work in the cloisters which must also have impressed those Frenchmen who saw it.

54 *Ibid.*, 16.

55 *Ibid*, 39-40

56 Charles d'Amboise had a country residence at Gaglianico, north-west of Turin, where murals depicting Gaillon were painted sometime *c.* 1510; on Gaglianico, see Rosci and Chastel 1963.

57 *Ibid.*, 90.

58 Liou 1997, 6.

1502, the new programme of work embraced the entire extent of the buildings at Gaillon some of which would be entirely replaced, such as the chapel.[59] This was matched by an even greater expenditure on his palace in Rouen where d'Amboise eventually expended some twenty million *livres*, this compared to the more modest figure of 145,000 *livres* spent at Gaillon.

Gaillon - '...le plus beau je n'en ai jamais vu,'[60]

For André Chastel, Gaillon was '... the edifice that most typifies the early Renaissance, triggering the evolution that culminated in Fontainebleau and Écouen.'[61] The château, which had been a possession of the archbishops of Rouen ever since the thirteenth-century, sits on a spur of land overlooking the small town of Gaillon with the river Seine beyond. Today, this sleepy French town is much neglected by tourists who favour instead Monet's gardens at nearby Vernon – a curious irony as Gaillon once had its own, much famed, gardens.[62]

Gaillon was taken by the English in 1424 and partially demolished, the castle only being recovered in 1453 by Cardinal d'Estouteville (d. 1483).[63] Reconstruction of the castle began in 1454, with the south entrance and the Tour d'Estouteville being amongst the principal structures built at this time, although d'Amboise would later remodel both.[64] Much of the diaper-styled brickwork in the revetment to the moat presumably belongs to this period of work.[65]

59 The account rolls make it clear however that it was the gardens on which the greatest level of expenditure was being made, and not the main complex of buildings; on this, see Deville 1850, 'sommaire' unpaginated page preceding p.1.

60 A. de Beatis, secretary to the Cardinal Luigi d'Aragona, who described the palace following his visit to Gaillon in 1517-18; on this record, see Weiss 1953.

61 Chastel 1995, 138; see also Weiss, 1953, 1-12.

62 On these gardens, see Lesueur 1935, 90-117.

63 Chirol 1952, 20-23.

64 Liou 1997, 85. She noted that as the building accounts for 1463 record work on seven brick chimneys the castle must have been rather small. This quite ludicrous assertion makes the assumption that all the chimneys at Gaillon were represented by this entry; further, she clearly fails to understand that a single chimney could and did serve many hearths. We may also note that building complexes in this period were not noted for their profusion of private rooms equipped with hearths.

65 Pers obs.

By the time Georges d'Amboise took over the château, it would have been an integrated structure composed of ranges of buildings arranged around two or more courtyards. These d'Amboise set about revamping and reworking, utilising a mixture of styles that included both Flamboyant Gothic at its most airy, later with a mixture of Italianate styles.[66]

Our understanding of the look of the exterior of the château is greatly helped by the existence of several views of the château, produced before the mid-sixteenth century. One of these, a fresco in the chapel of the Castello Gaglianico,[67] a country palace northeast of Milan much used by Charles d'Amboise while he was governor of Milan, was almost certainly painted before 1510 and includes two views of Gaillon.[68] A drawing made before 1550 of the east face of Gaillon, and which also shows some aspects of the west and south faces, reveals many details of the ornamentation of the buildings and the level of tracery in the Flamboyant Gothic style that was applied to many of the structures (figs 12 and 13).[69] Gaillon also featured amongst the châteaux drawn by Du Cerceau (fig. 14).[70] Whilst none of these drawings is entirely accurate, and there is some dispute over the details they purport to represent, they do offer a view of an early sixteenth-century château that cannot be paralleled by an English exemplar.[71] Most notable here is the evidence for the now vanished figure sculpture set above buildings; for example the Grant Vis, the great stair tower set behind the chapel, featured a George and Dragon, while the chapel tower held statuary of sibyls. Charles Brandon's great house at Westhorpe in Suffolk (and probably his house in Southwark) and Henry VIII's palace at Nonsuch would also have sculptures set above the roof-line later in the century.[72]

66 Liou 1997, 88. It is clear from references in the accounts that masons employed by d'Amboise were working in buildings that were regarded as 'old' rather than creating buildings *de novo*.

67 Mineray 1991, cover illustration; and Liou 1997, 89-91.

68 On Gallanico, see Rosci and Chastel, 1963, 103-13.

69 The drawing in now in the National Museum, Stockholm; illustrated in Buckard *et al*, 1980, 42. See also Liou 1997, 91-2.

70 Thompson 1988.

71 See Thurley's study of the Tudor royal palaces which underlines this point, Thurley 1993 and Thurley 2003, who demonstrates that the earliest depictions of Tudor buildings date from the mid sixteenth century.

72 For Westhorpe, see Gunn and Lindley 1991.

Gaillon was transformed in the years between 1501 and 1510,[73] and both Chirol and Liou discusses the physical and documentary evidence for this. It is not my intention to describe in detail this transformation, but rather to draw attention to a number of facets of this enterprise that are relevant to the study of the frieze at St Cross. It should be noted that Liou did not examine architectural detail closely, being more concerned with the overall picture, the statuary and the medallions.[74] Liou's work contains no analysis of architectural motifs, nor does she examine the differing treatment of different parts of the buildings; for example it is clear that the south gate was embellished with motifs that do not fully march with those employed on the Court of Honour – the main central courtyard of the complex.[75] The *boiseries* of the chapel provide a further range of Renaissance motifs, set in a style that are of themselves discrete from those employed on the fabric of the building, but these too Liou did not analyse or discuss.

These reservations aside, Liou provides the framework – alongside Chirol's 1952 survey and Deville's 1850 full transcription of the building accounts – that is the point of departure for this and any other study of Gaillon. I must highlight here the use of the Gaillon building accounts.[76] These provide a detailed annual accounting for sums spent on the works at Gaillon with, importantly, the names of individual craftsmen being recorded, often with the work for which they were being paid being described. It is a very detailed record, as may be seen from the transcript of the account for the work done in fitting out the chapel with woodwork.[77] From these accounts we can determine from where individual craftsmen came, their

73 Weiss 1953, 1, noted the 'enormous sum' of over 145,000 *livres* was expended on Gaillon; was he aware that d'Amboise spent 20 million *livres* on his archiepiscopal palace?

74 On the medallions see also, La Coste-Messeliere, 1957, 65-70. There were eventually upwards of 70 medallions placed at Gaillon, many of them apparently in the same style as those at the Certosa di Pavia.

75 This problem has to an extent been addressed by Guillaume and Thomas in their 1994 Tours conference papers, in Guillaume 2003, (note that these conference papers were up-dated in the light of subsequent research and publications).

76 The main set of accounts run from 1501-1509 and record the expenditure of 145,000 livres and the employment of some 80 names artists and craftsmen; the entire set of accounts were transcribed and published with a substantial preamble by Deville who also noted that there were fragmentary accounts for work at Gaillon the proceeded the 1501 account, on which see Deville 1850, xviii-xx.

77 This section of the Gaillon expense accounts is reproduced here as Appendix 1.

nationalities and, on occasion, identify the ateliers to which they belonged.[78] This in turn has important implications for understanding the differences in detail presented by the buildings and internal fittings at Gaillon.[79]

It should be noted that following the French Revolution, Gaillon was literally torn apart, with its contents dispersed and its fittings ripped out and sold off,[80] and the very fabric of the buildings torn down with much of the architectural stonework being taken to Paris.[81] The fate of the chapel woodwork I shall describe below. Much was lost and many of the more attractive pieces disappeared into private collections; thus of the 70 or so medallions that once adorned Gaillon, less than a dozen are now known to survive.[82]

The ground plan of Gaillon is relatively straightforward. The principal buildings of the château are arranged around a roughly rectangular-shaped courtyard to which access is provided by two large gatehouses (fig. 14). This reflects the earlier, medieval, nature of the site, which was established as a fortress guarding the River Seine (Richard I's great Norman castle of Château Gaillard is a few miles downstream). This was an important medieval fortress, one that was remodelled to become a luxurious house, and we may note that d'Amboise chose to re-work an existing building rather than build on a new site. To this we can add that redevelopment of Gaillon was not undertaken to any discernible blueprint, instead

78 A substantial part of Deville's preamble comprises an analysis of who these craftsmen were and their trades, thus for example he lists and describes the work of the seven 'Imagiers' including Michault Colombe and Anthoine Just (Deville 1850, cxix-cxxvi), alongside a description based on the accounts of individual structures. This certainly eases the work of those who follow in Deville's footsteps but the accounts themselves still require reading to tease out the fuller picture.

79 While not especially relevant here, the building accounts reveal that the early stages of d'Amboise's rebuilding of Gaillon were carried out by Tourrangeaux craftsmen such as Colin Byart, who had worked previously at Blois. There is very strong suspicion that Louis XII's work at Blois, pre-dating d'Amboise's at Gaillon, was to some extent influenced by Italian taste and ideas. There is therefore a case to suggest that Italian influences at Gaillon were being felt earlier that Liou or Chirol admit to.

80 Weiss 1953, 2, describes this rather aptly as, 'total desolation.'

81 Much of the architectural stonework was re-erected at the Ecole des Beaux Arts, Paris. Ward 1926, 20-1, provides a plate showing architectural material from Gaillon arranged as a composite.

82 A parallel to this dispersal of Renaissance work is provided by the removal of a château that stood at Les Andelys. This was taken by barge to England and incorporated in the house at Highcliffe, just to the east of Christchurch (Hampshire) On this house; see Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 291-2.

the new work evolved over the decade as new architectural and artistic influences gained popularity.

At the beginning of the rebuilding project, Gothic and Flamboyant Gothic styles predominated with, as far as we can tell, little trace of Italian influence until 1506-7. This is based on the assumption that named Italian craftsmen, as revealed in the building accounts, were wholly responsible for Italian-styled work at Gaillon. This seems surprising. If this were indeed correct, it would appear that Italian influences on French architecture took several years to gather pace, rather than having an almost immediate impact. The two styles of Gothic and Italian Renaissance were mingled at Gaillon, with one or the other being the preponderant form but rarely did the Italian style emerge free of Gothic influences.

As I noted above, Blunt described the work at Gaillon as having been the product of the workmanship of both French and Italian craftsmen, although he did not provide details. The emphatically Renaissance styled western gatehouse at Gaillon was remodelled by the French mason Pierre Fain, with the architectural embellishment directed by the Italian sculptor Gerolamo Pachiarotti, between 1507 and 1509.[83] As we will see, the similarly styled chapel woodwork was begun in 1509 and was the product of a team of *menusiers* (woodcarvers) including Nicholas Castille.[84] Their work may well have been influenced by the presence of the Italian painter, Andreas de Solario,[85] and the Italian sculptor, Antoine Giusti,[86] both of whom worked at Gaillon at the same time. However, it is clear from the building accounts that Nicholas Castille was carving wood with classical motifs before the Italian craftsmen arrived; an entry in the 1506-7 account reads, '*... Nicholas Castille, menuyssier, tailleur d'antique, pour le pavilion de jardin. xx*[l]*i*' ;[87] this one of several

83 Liou 1997, 126; and see Deville 1850, 431-34 for the relevant accounts.

84 See Deville 1850, cxxxix-cxliii and 391-5, for the detailed account of payments for the woodwork of the chapel.

85 Weiss 1953, 2, noted that d'Amboise also had paintings by Mantegna and Perugino, neither however came to Gaillon.

86 Blunt 1973, 37, noted that the Giusti brothers (Antonio 1479-1519) and Giovanni (1485-1549) arrived in France *c.*1505, settling in Tours and changing their name to Juste, and formed a dynasty of sculptors lasting until after the mid-century.

87 Deville 1850, 244; and see pp. 244 and 249 for further, identical, entries.

references to Castille as '*...tailleur d'antique*'.[88] Castille came from Rouen and had worked on the archiepiscopal palace in 1501-2, he was then working at Gaillon from 1503-9 and, contemporaneously in 1507-8, on the abbot's lodgings of St Ouen in Rouen, and on Rouen cathedral after 1510.[89] It is surely evident from this that the antique style was being applied sometime before the arrival of Italian artists.

It is the furnishing of the chapel at Gaillon that is of particular interest, and it is to this I now turn. Recognised as one of the premier products of the early or premier French Renaissance, the surviving stalls from Gaillon, twelve in number, provide the strongest connection between the stallwork at St Cross and Italian sources. In their overall design, the two suites of work could hardly be more different but, when we look closely at the overall design of individual panels and, further, cross-compare the motifs and images used in both, we find there are many instances of similarity.

The Chapel at Gaillon.

The chapel is set at the southern end of the so-called Grant Maison, or the main east range, and abuts the Galerie sur Val, an open-fronted, arcaded gallery running the length of the east range (figs 12, 13 and 14).[90] This gallery was also the setting for a collection of terracotta statues and marble medallions.[91] Work on building the chapel masonry began in 1502 and was completed in 1508.[92] It was a two storey building, with an upper and a lower chapel, built in the Flamboyant Gothic style, complete with flying buttresses, pinnacles and crockets in profusion, with stained glass windows two stories high.[93]

88 Deville 1850, cxlii and 245; Castille was working on the timberwork of the pavilion in the garden. Deville gives Castille's first name as Colin in his introduction to the building accounts though it is clear from his description that Colin and Nicholas, as he is named in the accounts themselves, are presumably one and the same.

89 Deville 1850, cxlii, n.1.

90 The gallery at Gaillon closely resembles that at Blois, built for Louis XII, which is of a similar date.

91 Liou 1997, 116-119.

92 *Ibid*, 120-22: and see Deville 1850, lxvii-lxxvii.

93 The glass from the chapel has long gone, but we can gain an impression of its quality from contemporary glass in Rouen Cathedral and from glass collected together from now-

Most of the chapel at Gaillon has been demolished but we have only to look at the west front of Rouen Cathedral, or the nearby church of St Maclou, to gain an impression of how the chapel at Gaillon would have looked. The chapel was surmounted by a bell tower, as may be seen from de Cerceau's engraving (fig. 11 and see also figs 12, 13 and 14). This, by contrast with the remainder of the building, was in the Italianate style and decorated with three sibyls made, the building accounts reveal, by Guillaume de Bourges in 1509;[94] this presumably marked the completion of the physical structure of the chapel.

We know very little about the interior of the lower chapel even though this still survives, but the upper chapel is both well documented and there are surviving artefacts from it – particularly the stalls with their associated woodwork, the altar rail and an altar front.[95] The upper chapel was 17 metres long and 10.4 metres wide and apsidal in shape. The plan of the east end of the chapel shows that the apse was formed by six segments, the majority of which was glazed (fig. 13). Beyond this we know nothing of the layout of the chapel and its fittings. We can nevertheless make some useful deductions from what we know of the decoration of the chapel and use these to gain some idea of how the stalls were arranged and the space they occupied. The door leading into the chapel from its western end perhaps opened onto a narrow space bounded by a *cloiture* (screen) leaving a quite small area, of 6 to 7 metres long, for a 'nave' although, as this was a private chapel, the concept of nave is inappropriate here.[96] There was then a second screen which formed the west face to a suite of elaborately carved and decorated stalls with, somewhat to the east of these, an altar rail that closed off the sanctuary. The stalls are the main point of interest here, but they were part of a wider scheme of work which should also be taken into account.

destroyed Rouennais churches into the modern church of Joan of Arc in the Vieux Marché, Rouen – truly a bejewelled treasure house of late medieval and Renaissance glass.

94 The figures were carved by Guillaume de Bourges, the payment account reads, 'A Guillaume de Bourges, ymagier, pour trios ymages de Pierre a mectre sur la chapelle, par quictance du ix^{e} aoust v^{c} neuf, xv^{tt}' (see Deville 1850, lxix, and p.357); Liou 1997, 122.

95 Huard 1926, 21-31, and Vasselot 1927, 321-369, provide much detail for the dispersal of art work from the chapel and its subsequent fate.

96 The chapel door is now in the south transept of St Denis, and the cloitures are at Ecouen.

In 1507 the Italian painter, Andrea Solario, arrived at Gaillon to paint frescos, primarily working in the upper chapel and working thereafter in other parts of the chateau until 1509.[97] Some details of the frescos were recorded in the seventeenth century and we are told they represented the twelve members of the d'Amboise family, all kneeling, six either side of the chapel. Solario also produced a triptych for the chapel, on one panel of which was the figure of St George. This saint, along with John the Baptist, was much venerated by Cardinal d'Amboise.[98] Saint George also appeared amongst the panels in the chapel stallwork.[99] At much the same time the Florentine sculptor, Antonio di Giusto, executed thirteen almost life-sized terracotta figures of Jesus and the disciples, these also for the chapel.[100]

Perhaps the most famed piece of work to arrive at Gaillon, in 1508/9, was the altar front carved by Michel Colombe,[101] the only piece of his work to appear at this château. He was by this time an elderly man and anyway much employed by Louis XII and his queen, Anne of Brittany, with little time to undertake commissions for anyone else, thus his undertaking to carve an altar front for Cardinal d'Amboise again informs us of d'Amboise's own prestige. Colombe's marble slab was framed by pilasters and mouldings, in an Italianate style, that were carved by Gerolamo Pachiarotti,[102] an Italian sculptor who arrived at Gaillon to install another fountain,

97 For payments made to Solario, see Deville 1850, cxxxv, 338-39, 361-63, 418-19; and see Liou 1997, 239-40. Solario perhaps also painted scenes in the long gallery bounding one side of the upper garden. This featured a hunting scene showing the Louis XII, Cardinal d'Amboise, princes, nobles and women in Lombardic costume riding in chariots and chasing butterflies and insects, Liou 1997, 121.

98 On the cult of St George, see Riches 2000.

99 Liou 1997, 219-220; she did not in fact fully appreciate that there is a wider story of St George in these panels and mis-identifies one of the panels as a scene from the martyrdom of St Andrew.

100 The heads of two of these, of Jesus and of St Paul, are now to be found in the parish church at Gaillon (to which, sadly, I did not manage to gain access on my two visits to Gaillon), with a third, St Peter (for which see Buckard et al 1980, 54-5) in the Louvre. On payments to Guisto (Just in the building accounts), see Deville 1850, cxxiv-cxxvi, 435-36.

101 Rieder 1977, 350 suggests this panel was placed above the altar, a proposition which seems to me to be unlikely. See Deville 1850, cxxvi-vii, 308 and 332 for entries relating to Michel Colombe.

102 Gerolamo Pachiarotti is named in the Gaillon accounts as 'Geraulme Pacherot', cf Deville 1850, 308-9, and in Liou's dissertation he is named as *Geralamo Pachiarotti*, Liou 1997, 164.

this one from Genoa.[103] The altar frontal shows St George slaying the dragon, with, to one side, the Princess standing in a rocky landscape.[104]

The destruction of the upper chapel means that we have little idea as to the spatial arrangements of its fixtures and fittings. It is however worthwhile attempting to recreate this setting as this enables us to assess the remaining pieces of work from the chapel in relation to each other, rather than just as individual pieces. Further, this has some bearing on how we are able to assess the original organisation of the stalls at St Cross.

The substantial areas of glazing in the apsidal, east end of the chapel seem to militate against the altar standing against the east wall. Indeed, practicalities of use make it more probable that the altar stood into the body of the chapel. What of Giusto's terracotta figures? There is no suggestion that these stood outside the chapel or on its roof. It is possible that these figures were set up around the periphery of the chapel, perhaps in an ambulatory. However, the size of the chapel and the spatial requirements of the stalls indicate that this was perhaps not the case, as these figures could then barely have been seen. They may have instead been set against the seven window pillars of the apse, with Christ in the centre and the disciples set in pairs either side. Such an arrangement would certainly call for the altar to be set in the mid-point of the apse. The altar was closed off from the remainder of the chapel by an altar rail, this survives, but where was it placed?

We might conclude from this that the sanctuary, composed of altar and other fittings and bounded by the altar rail, occupied anything from 3 to 5 metres of the east end of the chapel. The surviving stalls set in a line, stretch for 4.5 metres. However there is evidence on the stalls themselves to show that there were return stalls, probably two on either side, to provide 16 seats in all. Overall, then, the stallwork would have occupied a space of up to 7 metres long and have had a depth, including the return stalls, of up to 4 metres either side, leaving approximately a 5 metre space at the west end of the chapel. The stalls would thus almost certainly

103 This fountain was set up in a square building, called the Lydieu which was built in the middle of the gardens (see fig. 11).

104 Colombe's altar piece is now in the Louvre; while his work on the panel is much discussed, Pachiarotti's carved frame is barely noted and is frequently cut from any illustration of the piece.

have stood against the walls of the chapel. This analysis would seem to suggest that although the return stalls have been lost what remains at the Basilica of St Denis comprises the full extent of the main ranges of stallwork.

Dating the Gaillon stallwork [105]

The building accounts reveal that a large team of men was assembled to create the chapel stalls (or *chaires* as they are termed in the accounts).[106] Nicholas Castille is often thought to have been the supervising craftsmen for this work, but his role in the stallwork is restricted to a single entry in the 1508-9 account; he was paid only 18 livres for supplying many pieces of wood.[107] This hardly suggests he had the lead role, and it is likely that this was taken by Richard Carpe.[108] Amongst the wood used in the creation of the chairs was oak from Ireland, with some 60 pieces bought from Nicolas Georget in March 1508.[109]

Further payments for the chapel woodwork continued from 1510 until 1518, but exactly what was being paid for is not recorded but this payment has often been taken to indicate that the stalls were created after 1509-10.[110] What has been omitted from this argument is that the 1518 payment only amounted to some 100 *livres*, whereas the 1508-09 account records the payment of some 1,500 *livres*. I believe that this interpretation is incorrect and it is my contention that the stallwork was created and completed before 1510, which, given that the remainder of the work on the chapel and its fittings had been completed before 1508, seems entirely plausible. The implication of this re-dating is that this means the frieze at St Cross, seen as post-dating the Gaillon work (and thus to after 1518 on the basis of the later payments), can hypothetically also be reassigned to an earlier date.

105 The *boiseries* were not discussed or described by Chirol 1952.

106 Deville 1850, 391-95.

107 Deville 1850, 393.

108 Rieder 1977, 350, opined that it was Nicholas Castille who had the supervision of this work. The 'who' is not especially germane to my argument here but is of a more general interest.

109 Deville 1850, 393.

110 I here follow the thoughts of Marquet de Vasselot who believed that the stalls were substantially completed before 1510, Vasselot, 1927, 324; but see Chirol 1958, 58 and Chirol 1952, 113 for a different view.

That the Gaillon stalls may have been further developed, or altered, after 1510 remains a possibility and is discussed below.

The chapel stalls

We may note at the outset that the stalls, as they now stand, were first assembled at St Denis early in the nineteenth century by François Debret; they were later pulled apart and re-erected by Eugène Viollet-le-Duc. This dismantling and re-erection was accompanied by alterations to the original fabric and the addition of new carvings.[111] I think we may assume from this that it is unlikely that the stalls have been re-assembled in their original positions or order.

Unlike the St Cross stallwork, the Gaillon suite is decorated from top to bottom, and edge to edge, either with relief carvings, intarsia work or free-standing statuary (fig. 15). The overall form of the stalls is that of a standard ecclesiastical setting of individual tipping seats, with misericords, separated one from the next by armrests (figs 15 and 16). Each stall has 14 elements, termed here G1-G14, with the canopy and its frieze above (fig. 16) and to which Liou gave a systematic numbering system that I have slightly elaborated. To this should of course be added the desks that once stood in front of the stalls, and which added a further dimension.[112] I shall first describe the decorative scheme of the stall and consider questions of phasing later.

111 Vasselot, 1927, 331-35. Additions to the stallwork appear to be confined to the replacement of elements of the statuary.

112 The desks are now at Ecouen.

G1	Upper tier of historiated panels showing scenes from the Bible and the Golden Legend.
G2	Lower tier panels in intarsia work, featuring sibyls and virtues.
G3	Pilaster, Gothic style, with niches for statuettes of apostles and saints.
G4	Seat back. Italianate grotesque-style panels carved in low relief with arabesque foliage, fantastic creatures, antique vases, putti, masks and imaginary motifs.
G5	Seat top surface, in intarsia work, grotesques framed with classical geometric borders.
G6	Misericord, in intarsia work, further grotesques.
G7	Bottom board, carved in low relief and similar to 4 and 9.
G8	Misericord support, figures in high relief with, below, secondary series of figures inter-connected to low-relief carving on 9.
G9	Seat under-surface, carved in low relief and similar to 4 and 7.
G10	Face of armrest, upper part, carved in low relief and featuring figures with vegetative frame.
G11	Front of arm rest, carvings in the round of craftsmen etc.
G12	Face of arm rest, lower part, intarsia work, featuring scenes from mythology, war, hell etc.
G13	Bottom of seat divider, intarsia work, similar to 12.
G14	Lower part of face of arm rest, fantastic or grotesque faces.
G15	The canopy
G16	Dado with frieze

Table 1: Components of the Gaillon stalls (and see fig. 16). The prefix G is for Gaillon.

The main area of interest here are the panels carved in light relief: the G4, G7 and G9 panels along with the canopy panels, G15, and the desk front panels G17 (table 1 and fig. 16). Additionally, we may note there is a vine-trail running the length of the stalls above the upper tier panels (G1) and below the panels in the canopy. A second vine trail frames each of the upper tier panels. Small animals,

dogs, birds, snails, flowers and thistles are scattered through these trails. Thistles? 'God provides all', as an ancient farmer I once knew used to say.

The parallels that may be drawn between the Gaillon and St Cross stalls appear in the following elements at Gaillon are as follows:

- ~ The seat backs (G4)
- ~ The under-side of the tipping seats (G9)
- ~ The bottom boards (G7)
- ~ The canopy (G15)
- ~ The stall desks provide panels similar to G4 and have pilaster divisions with motifs similar to those at St Cross. Also, the desks have a terminal volute that at St Cross is provided by a dolphin.

To these we can add several pieces of worked timber, which include an archway, presumably to span a door or perhaps the entry into the chancel at Gaillon, and several posts with capitals (fig. 18).[113]

The one motif that is almost entirely missing from the Gaillon suite is medallions. The Gaillon stallwork contains only the one (fig. 19), although, as noted above, there were medallions aplenty incorporated into the fabric of the buildings at Gaillon and medallions also featured in both the chapel *cloitures* and other elements of *boiseries* associated with the chapel. These are discussed below.

The seat backs (G4)

The rectangular seat backs, and the panels in the desk fronts, provide a series of panels which are filled with fantastic creatures, masks, urns of various types, cornucopias and floral motifs arranged symmetrically around centred images and with further images linked with foliate rinceaux (figs 19, 20, 21 and 22). Apart from the horns arranged on the heads of various creatures we may note that there are

113 All of these are now at Écouen but there is no record of where these pieces came from.

many other direct parallels with the St Cross work. The creatures curled around on their backs and the stance of the fantastic bird, note its leg standing on a plume emerging from the dolphin (fig. 21), and this is very close to images at St Cross. The masks in profile with pecking birds and the putto set above an urn (fig. 22) find similar echoes in the St Cross frieze. The centred putto with its hands in the mouths of the affronted, scaly-winged creatures are re-defined in the St Cross lower tier north frames; note too the treatment of the putto in the panel shown in figure 19, this is also taken into the St Cross sequence. The treatment and form of much of the floral and folial motifs is much the same, as is the working of the urns. The full range of the parallels between the Gaillon stalls and the St Cross frieze is discussed below in Chapter 9.

Almost as important here is the level of un-worked, or un-carved, field in each panel. The rinceaux here are loosely wound, and there is an emphasis on lightness and space so that the rinceaux do not here entirely fill the fields. This appears to be a feature of this phase of the French Renaissance rinceaux and provides a means of separating different sets of work with the possibility that, in time, these can be more accurately dated.

The underside of the tipping seats (G9)

The central element present in the G4 panels is replaced in this series by the misericord, which is surrounded by more closely wound rinceaux amongst which nestle various fantastic creatures (fig. 23, 24 and 25). Of particular note are the birds and dolphins, plumed but not horned, the sphinx-like creature and a second horned, sphinx-like creature (fig. 24) with a further creature lying on its back (fig. 25). The sphinx seems to have been an especially popular motif as it appears frequently in the Gaillon stalls, but only twice in the St Cross ensemble.

The bottom boards (G7)

The looser rinceaux here are again arranged around a centred object or motif (figs 26, 27, 28 and 29). Of note are the terminal flowers which are taken into the repertoire at St Cross as dolphin terminals and into the Silkstede stalls re-used as rinceaux terminals.[114] The putto holding a pair of affronted, horned, birds parallels the putto in lower tier north frames at St Cross. The dolphins emerging from scrollwork and, in turn, from cornucopias are matched many times in frames at St Cross, especially in the south-side lower tier sequence. The same style of dolphins appears also in the Gaillon canopy panels. The somewhat menacing putti do not reappear at St Cross although the general treatment of their bodies does, note the line between the body and 'skirt'; the idea of the putto with birds is taken straight into the north-side lower tier sequence at St Cross. In the same panel, note the stance of the fantastic birds, straddling the rinceaux and with their long, condensed tails.

The canopy panels (G15)

As with the other panels, the canopy panels feature a centred object – here all are urns – supported by loosely wound rinceaux and scrollwork (figs 30, 31 and 32). These panels are mostly arranged in an alternating sequence with a tall urn (fig. 30) succeeded by a short urn (fig. 32). While there is some variation in the fine detail, the overall sequence is fully symmetrical both individually and as a composition. The short urn (fig. 32) is set on a double tiered stand formed from leaves, from the upper tier emerges slashed scrollwork that curves in a volute with balled terminals, the lower tier is extended out into foliage from which emerge dolphins with plumes, but no horns, with further folial rinceaux above. The urn is capped with a winged putto's head. The tall urns (fig. 30) feature leaves (?) emerging from the narrow mouth and neck of a tall urn, which is set on a studded base. The urn is framed by a pair of horned creatures that are more bird-like than dolphin, these are linked with

114 See p. 253-54; and see Riall 2003 (copy on figures DVD).

slashed scrollwork to cornucopias that emerge from the urn stand. Further floral rinceaux surrounds the central grouping.

The desks [115]

The panels of the desk are framed with rails and pilasters all of which are covered with relief carving similar to that used in some of the *cloiture* carving (fig. 18). The pilasters, which terminate in capitals, feature motifs that are similar to those on the St Cross pilasters, but without the range seen at St Cross. The rails have a running frieze of dolphins and scrollwork supporting wide urns with flames interspaced by winged putti heads. The desk ends have volute terminals that are carved in the same style as the volutes set between each of the canopy panel. As at St Cross, the designs for the capitals differ one from the next although the component parts of volutes, leaves and so on are very similar. The motifs carved down the pilasters are repeated from one pilaster to the next, apart from the desk-end pilasters which offer a different range. We should also note here the way the candelabra is suspended from the head of the pilaster: tied with a knot in the *cloiture* work but looped over a hasp on the desk fronts. The stalls, by contrast, have Gothic-styled pilasters completed with niches for saints and other pieces of figure sculpture but there are also Renaissance motifs to be found here.

Other carved timber

At Écouen are three further sets of timber together with what may have been a communion or altar rail. Two sets of these are *cloitures,* that is, carved screens that served to enclose a space. Both are carved on either face, and both are fundamentally in a Gothic-style with Renaissance panels carved with designs that parallel those

[115] Permission to photograph the desks with the aid of artificial light sources was refused by the staff at the Musée de la Renaissance at Écouen, the photographs given here were all taken with available light which was less than wonderful in the chapel at Écouen (where the desks are displayed) and particularly poor in the room holding the majority of pieces of boiseries from Gaillon. The staff at Ecouen provided me with many photocopies of photographs in their collections, for which I am most grateful.

employed in the loggia (figs 33 and 34). The fact that they are worked on both faces precludes these having been used as a screen set against the west face of the stalls (*i.e.* facing back into the body, or nave, of the chapel). It seems possible one may have been used close to the entrance of the (upper) chapel while the second was used elsewhere, perhaps in the lower chapel or even in the cardinal's personal oratory.

There remain two further posts and an arched piece with posts that could have been used in a doorway or entrance. This material (fig. 18) may well have formed the west face of the stallwork, and this would reflect a continuity of style from the desks, as similar motifs and designs are present in both. It is difficult to understand why the stalls have Gothic pilasters. Does this reflect a change of designers and style during the construction of the stalls? When we look closely at the stalls we observe that it is only the framework that is Gothic, apart of course from the actual setting of a range of tipping seats with misericords which had been the style of choice for the past two centuries and more. All the marquetry work reflects an Italianate origin (fig. 15), we may note that dolphins with horns are to be found amongst these panels too, especially so on the upper face, the seat, of the misericords (figs 23, 24 and 25). The historiated G1 panels are framed with Renaissance architectural elements, while the lower tier G2 panels have an open-work frieze featuring dolphins and other Renaissance motifs set along their top edges. We might therefore conclude that what began as an essay in Gothic style was, somewhere along the way, transformed into a Renaissance setting leaving intact a framework executed in a Gothic style but filled with panels in the latest Renaissance idiom.

The important point here is the organisation of the motifs on the pilasters, their setting and the treatment of the capitals. The candelabra are tied, with a little knot, to a ring at the head of the pilaster and drop down the face of the post to terminate in a tassel. The motifs are strung one above the next and are simplistic and un-contrived. All the motifs in the Gaillon work re-appear in the St Cross suite, save that at St Cross there are many more types of motif. A further change between the two is that in the St Cross pilaster series no two pilasters have a string of motifs arranged exactly the same. The terminal tassel is common to both. The Gaillon pilaster capitals are echoed in the St Cross work although the replacement of volutes with dolphin heads does not re-appear. This treatment of motif and capital, their

arrangement and characteristics are important for the parallels they provide between the two sets of work, perhaps more so than the larger motifs, such as the dolphins, or, in the wider perspective, the overall design of individual or collective panels. Why so? While there is a case to suggest that the designs could be transmitted through woodblock prints or engravings, it seems much harder to accept that very small motifs, no more than a centimetre or two square, can be transmitted in this manner. It is of course the horned creatures that are so particular to the two suites that provide the strongest link.

Sibyls

The lower tier panels in the Gaillon stalls feature a series of posed female figures dressed in heavy drapery (fig. 15). These represent virtues and sibyls, as the banner each carries reveals. Sibyls had been introduced into Christian art early in the fifteenth century and, by the early sixteenth century, had become a popular addition to decorative schemes in cathedrals, churches and chapels. The inclusion of sibyls in a set of stalls appears to be another defining link between the two sets of stallwork and this is discussed further below, see chapter 8.

Medallions

The most strikingly and obvious element of the St Cross frieze are the medallions. This significant usage finds no parallel in the Gaillon stallwork where the tiers of historiated panels, and the marquetry panels with sibyls beneath, command primary interest. There were medallions in others sections of the Gaillon woodwork, for example one of the G4 backs features a medallion as do one of the *cloitures*, although none of these provide profile portraits composed in a Classical style; the medallions here are either half-round, head and shoulder portraits or narrative pictures. But we may also note that the whole style of these panels, and the pilasters that stand between them, are out of character with the pilasters of the desks and associated

woodwork described above. Gone is the linear, simple arrangement that is characteristic of the desk and post material; now the motifs are crammed closer together and the whole design has become more complex with motifs suspended from other motifs to produce branched candelabra. The rinceaux have also become more complex, no longer do the motifs flow in a straightforward, geometric curve but are interrupted and cross over so that a motif is superimposed upon the curl of the rinceaux. Most noticeable of all is the absence of horned creatures, although the repertoire of motifs still includes motifs that are present in the stallwork. This modification was accompanied by a possible return to using Gothic-styled framing for the panels, which seems altogether perverse, but is also echoed in the St Cross work where the medallions are suspended from ogee arches that have emerged from the Gothic vocabulary – not the Renaissance. The same phenomena can be observed at Evreux cathedral where pilasters à la Gaillon are set in a Gothic-style framework.[116] The Gaillon *cloitures* then seem potentially to belong to the post-1509/10 phase of work, following the death of Georges d'Amboise.[117]

Work on the stalls post 1510

The death of Georges d'Amboise in 1510 may well have interrupted the rebuilding of Gaillon, and we have no idea when work resumed. D'Amboise himself was buried in his cathedral church in Rouen, in the lady chapel, and here an elaborate tomb was built for him, with Nicholas Castille leading the work. The tomb is covered in Italianate motifs, prophets, apostles and sibyls, a plaque depicting St George and a kneeling effigy of Georges d'Amboise (fig. 35).[118] Somewhat

116 Pers. obs.

117 Rieder 1977 examined the *cloitures* but did not set them in context with the remainder of the Gaillon woodwork; Liou 1997, 208-14, makes no comment on the overall design of these panels or explores the differences in the arrangement of the motifs. See also, Thurley 1993, 85-111 (panels from Gaillon are illustrated on p.91).

118 Georges d'Amboise had a particular veneration for John the Baptist, but St George was also represented many times in the decorative schemes at Gaillon, one of the more important being Michel Colombe's altar frontal depicting St George slaying the dragon, with another depiction on his tomb. While this may reflect an association with his name, it should be noted that an early bishop of Rouen, St Roumain, is associated with a dragon-slaying episode that has similarities to the legend of St George. Thus the St George depictions associated with Cardinal d'Amboise could well embody this local legend.

impertinently, his nephew and successor, Georges d'Amboise II, later elbowed his uncle along a bit and had his own effigy placed behind.[119]

Work did eventually resume at Gaillon, some of this, as has been observed, being directed at the stalls. Amongst the payments recorded in the 1508-09 account rolls is one to Thibault Roze 'pour vi peaulx de parchemin velin pour faire les pourtraicts des chaires de la chapelle ... xv^{s}'.[120] One of these drawings may perhaps have survived and was found in 1952 in the archives in Vienne.[121] The drawing shows a set of stalls with tipping seats decorated very much in the manner in which the Gaillon stalls now appear but, crucially, without the upper tiers of marquetry and historiated panels nor a canopy. Instead is spire work very much in a Gothic style. Did Georges d'Amboise II have the stalls at Gaillon extended and added to? This would certainly explain the differences in detail between the G4-G13 elements, these making up the seats and their surrounds, and the G1-G3 sections which comprise the two tiers of panels above and their framework. This leaves unexplained the canopy panels, G15, which clearly march with the stalls below. As I noted above, the sum of 100 *livres* was paid to Nicholas Castille in 1518. This cannot have been enough to have made substantial changes or additions to the work, thus it may be possible that other building accounts are missing. I would nevertheless argue that this does not change the position that in 1510 the bulk of the stallwork had been completed.

119 The tomb was built after Georges d'Amboise died in 1510, presumably with the patronage of and over-sight from Georges II. The tomb is spectacular for its superabundance of carved detail, which includes some of the earliest representations of American Indians in western Art. On the d'Amboise tomb, see Chirol, Lanfry and Bailly 1959; Bottineau-Fuchs 1982; and Bottineau-Fuchs 1985. None of these papers offer a full and detailed guide to the statuary and carved details of the tomb.

120 *Ibid.*, 393.

121 It was found by René Crozet. The drawing in described in Chirol 1958.

The Cour d'Honneur

As I mentioned above, Italianate work pervaded the whole extent of the buildings at Gaillon. These however were decorated in a style that differs from that applied to the chapel stalls. This can be seen in the Cour d'Honneur (figs 11 and 14) where there were three galleries that featured pillars supporting friezes over which were rectangular panels with windows in between each.[122] These panels held medallions set within floral frames and are accompanied by rinceaux, and bordered by pilasters filled with small motifs set in candelabra. Some of the columns supporting these galleries have survived and these too are profusely carved (fig. 34), but the detailing on these differs from that employed in the chapel. We may note that elements of Gothic architecture are still to be found here, added to the top of otherwise Classical pillars, as in the loggia of the grant maison, or more fully as the pillars themselves that support the north gallery.

The Galerie des Cerfs was begun by Colin Byart in 1505,[123] he had worked previously at Blois, which provides an explanation for the similarity of the two galleries, and was completed in 1509 with medallions set in place by Antonio di Giusto. A triumphal gate, the Porte des Gênes,[124] was inserted into this gallery by 1508 and this provides a further range of rinceaux and motifs, these again different to the style of the chapel woodwork. The northern gallery was begun in 1504 and completed in 1508 by Pierre Delorme;[125] here again the hand of Italian workmanship in the panels with medallions is evident. The loggia was added in 1508 under the supervision of Pierre Fain, although here we may strongly suspect the intervention of Gerolamo Pachiarotti who, at this time, was re-working the face of the entrance pavilion with a programme of Classical decoration and whose work on the chapel altar has been previously noted, although this too was identifiably in a different idiom to the chapel woodwork. The rinceaux, candelabra and programme of motifs on the Galerie des Cerfs, Porte des Gênes, loggia and entrance pavilion all mesh

122 On the Cour d'Honneur and the medallions there, see Buckard 1980, 47-52; and see also Liou 1997, 149-54

123 Liou 1997, 124-26.

124 *Ibid.*

125 *Ibid.*, 127-29.

together in an identifiable style that is very curvaceous, rich in floral attributes alongside classical arms and armour, but with fantastic creatures less evident.[126] But of horned creatures there is no trace at all.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to present a picture of the stalls at Gaillon, and to show that they were probably the model upon which the work at St Cross was based. Leaving aside the fact that while at Gaillon every available surface is covered in carved or intarsia work, at St Cross it is only the frieze and desk ends that are so treated, we are left with two sets of work that exhibit a strong sense of similarity, right down to very fine details, in both the selection and design of the component motifs that make up the programme of decoration. A particular linking motif is the horned animals which seem to appear in France primarily at Gaillon and emerge in England at St Cross. These did not appear in Torrigiano's tombs at Westminster Abbey nor in other Renaissance styled work in Winchester or Hampshire, apart from the dolphins in Silkstede's stalls in Winchester cathedral. Within the context of Italian work at Gaillon, while the stalls stand apart from the Renaissance workmanship on the fabric of the buildings, it is clear from the documentary evidence both were created contemporaneously.

It is my contention that the Gaillon stalls were substantially completed before 1510, a view that is supported by the expense accounts. I do not believe it is necessary to utilise a payment account of 1518 to suggest that the stalls should not be dated until then. This therefore opens up the possibility that the stalls at St Cross could have been created sometime soon after 1510. However, the evidence for the display of *all'antica* work in England before 1515 is exceedingly thin, and it is to this problem, the arrival and transmission of the style in England, that we must now turn.

126 Rinceaux in stonework at Gaillon and elsewhere in France are discussed by Thomas in Guillaume 2003, 177-86; no mention is made of the Gaillon stalls.

Chapter 3:

The arrival of the *all'antica* style in early Tudor Hampshire: distribution, historiography, and sources

AMONGST THE FIRST AREAS in England to experience the introduction of the Renaissance *all'antica* style was Hampshire. The style made its first meaningful appearance in the 1510s, although a frieze – for Langton's chapel in Winchester Cathedral – may be earlier than this. While the early forms of *all'antica* appear to have been embraced with some enthusiasm by senior officials of the Church and leading members of the gentry, there is little evidence that it gained widespread popular acceptance at this date. The style faded away in the 1540s, being replaced by 'strapwork' and other 'antique'-styled work applied to household features such as fireplace surrounds and wall decorations.

All of the known occurrences of the *all'antica* style in Hampshire are associated with ecclesiastical sites and settings, with the possible exception of a frieze and a ceiling from Winchester College and some wall panelling from The Vyne – these being also the only surviving examples of domestic interior décor in the style from Hampshire.[1] However, we do not know the extent to which this picture

[1] The Winchester College frieze dates to the mid-century and may have been created to adorn the wedding celebrations of Philip and Mary in 1555; on this frieze, see Lewis 1996

has been distorted through the demolition of monastic buildings following the Reformation; this may also have been accompanied by the loss of funereal monuments that might have been decorated in the *all'antica* style.[2]

This chapter established just what it is I mean by the term *all'antica*; alongside a historiography of Hampshire's *all'antica* work, the distribution of the style, and a survey of previous observers' discussions of the transmission and presence of the style.

Defining the style – what is all'antica?

All'antica – alongside 'antique' or 'anticke', 'Renaissance' and 'grotesque' – is a label for an artistic style that in large part drew upon Classical models for the inspiration to decorate a multitude of surfaces. These ranged from the façades of buildings, to tombs, and fountains, to household furnishings such as cassoni, chairs and cupboards, and to jewellery, picture frames, and window glass;[3] there was quite possibly no surface, or medium,[4] that was not considered in this period as suitable for such decoration.[5] Unlike Classical models that supplied the original idea, motifs executed in *all'antica* could be applied in many different ways. Underlying the style was a sense of fantasy, almost the ridiculous, especially so when zoomorphic elements were combined with the human from, these often being depicted in the

and for a comment rebutting Lewis, see Riall 2005. The wall panelling from the Oak gallery at The Vyne has never been examined in a wide ranging, academic paper although it is described in a catalogue written by W Harrison (undated) published by the National Trust. Neither work is described further here, the former as it lies outside the date range of the main body of work discussed below, the latter because it sheds no useful light on the introduction of *all'antica* work.

2 We may also note that a number of churches have been destroyed including the chapel of the Holy Ghost at Basingstoke. It was here that William, Lord Sandys was buried in an ornate tomb but this vanished sometime after the Civil war.

3 A useful overview of this range is given in Holman 1997, 1-15.

4 Amongst the less likely media to be decorated with *all'antica* was leather, see for example the leather hangings now in the British Museum and others at Hampton Court where the leather was pounded into a leather-mache and modelled along the lines of paper-mache.

5 The terminology of 'antique' is discussed in Howard 1987, 120-22.

form of putti – small, naked, pre-pubescent boys (girls almost never appear in these schemes).[6] Henry Peacham, writing in 1606, put it like this,

> '...the Italians call it L'Antica; it hath the principal use in plate, cloaks, armour, all manner of compartments, curious architecture, borders of maps, etc ... The forme of it is a general and (as I say) an *unnatural* or *unorderly* composition for delight's sake, of men, beasts, birds, fishes, flowers etc without (as we say) Rime or Reason; for the greater variety you show in your invention, the more you please ... You may if you chose draw naked boys riding and playing with their paper mills ... upon goats, eagles, dolphins etc; the bones of ramnes heads hung with strings of beads and Ribans, satyrs, Tritons, apes, cornucopias, doggs yoked and drawing cucumbers, cherries and any kind of wild trail or vine after your own invention, with a thousand more such idle things, so that herein you cannot be too *fantastical* ...' [7]

The italics are mine.

All'antica has its roots in Italian paintings and drawings created in the fifteenth century, for example in the work of Fra Angelico and Donatello, and, later, in those of Pintoricchio, Crivelli, Signorelli and Mantegna, all of whom consciously included Classical detail in their work, detail that was taken from standing Roman architecture or from Roman artefacts such as sarcophagi. Peter Thornton suggests that the Classical style in these works should be defined or labelled as *candelabrum*.[8] This would however be to ignore the wider usage of Classical motifs and ideas in all areas of these paintings, and in architecture also, and I have here restricted the use of candelabra to a more specific meaning, which is to describe the decorative work applied to a vertical space, such as a pilaster. The work of these artists was echoed in that of the architects, as for example at the Certosa di Pavia. In all of this earlier work there is a strong sense of geometricity, of interlacing designs in a regular and rhythmic manner but doing so without incorporating a super-abundance of fantastical shapes or creatures. This is especially evident in Pintoricchio's work, for

6 A rare example of female putti is to be seen in the carved worked of the Gaillon stalls now in St Denis, pers. obs.

7 Quoted from Lewis 1996, 151, and see also Croft-Murray, 1962, 26-27; and Howard 2003 which saw published his 1994 lecture to a conference held at Tours.

8 Thornton 1998, 19.

example his *Madonna with child* in the Basso della Rovere chapel, in the church of Santa Maria del Popolo in Rome.[9]

By contrast, *grotesque* did not make its appearance in Italy until the 1490s, subsequent to the discovery of Nero's Roman palace, the *Domus Aurea*. The partially rubble-filled rooms of this palace were serendipitiously entered by well diggers who discovered paintings that had remained hidden for almost a millennia and a half. Artists flocked to see these murals, the first such to be revealed from the ancient world, leaving their own graffiti in the process by writing their names and the dates of their visits, the earliest known being 1493.[10] The style was given an enthusiastic reception and it spread rapidly across Europe through the diffusion of prints and, if less swiftly, through paintings and the artists themselves.[11] Grotesque differs from the earlier antique-work in its airy application, for individual motifs are given far more room in this style, and the sense of impossible suspension down the vertical line of designs was emphasised alongside a widespread use of fantastical figures and animals. An early practitioner of this form of *all'antica* was Raphael whose logetta in the Vatican consummately captured the spirit and essence of the *Domus Aurea* fantasies. Grotesque as a term could be applied to English work but, in my view, it would be wrong to do so to material executed much before *c.*1520-5.[12]

There is also something to be said for describing the work as *fantastic*. The point of *fantasy*, as Peacham noticed, was to transform the recognisable, the every day, and the normal into something that was, well, fantastic. This could be achieved by scaling, for example by reducing the size of one motif and expanding the size of another, such as the putti astride the dolphins in the St Cross frieze; and also by bringing together and combining the unlikely, as again at St Cross through the use in combination of putti and masks, or of dolphins and urns. Another way to achieve

9 Illustrated in Luchinat 1999, 23 as fig. 25.

10 On the *Domus Aurea*, see Dacos 1969, and Iacopi 2001; a useful discussion on grotesque in connection with furniture is given in Miller1999, 94-7.

11 There is perhaps a case to argue that a true interpretation of grotesque did not arrive in England until the 1540s and its application to work at Henry VIII's Nonsuch palace, remnants from which are now at Loseley House, Surrey; on which, see Croft-Murray 1962, pp.164-65 and figs 18-20.

12 An example of the differences in the style can be seen in the chancel screens in Devon, especially the Atherington, Marwood and East Down series (all of the 1530s?) which have a distinct echo of the grotesquework of Nero's *Domus Aurea* and strikingly contrast with the frieze at St Cross which does not.

fantasy was to incorporate geometric motifs, such as volutes, with animal forms, for example the dolphins that emerge from volutes in the St Cross frieze. Fantastic was to take the natural, the ordinary or the mundane and make of it something that was quite different or exotic, if not quite impossible, in a way that made if fascinating and attractive; all of which we can of course observe as being true also of grotesque. There is a need to recognise that there were design qualities here too. It was not simply a matter of throwing a set of motifs together in some expectation that they would look good or aesthetically pleasing. Clearly much thought went into balancing the motifs involved, engaging them in some sort of symmetry and applying other rules that allow for space and setting.

For a thing to be *Classical* or *classicising* is perhaps to recognise a less over-heated style, one more closely dependent on Classical motifs and architectural constructs, even if these were used in un-classical settings and combinations. There is no fantasy incorporated here, or the feel of the grotesque but something different, more conservative. This feel for the Classical apparently underlies Wolsey's choices for terracotta work accompanying his Caesars set in their (Classical) medallions.[13] Similarly so his arms, set between a pair of putti with other Classical elements, which still remain at Hampton Court. Such can also be said of the north presbytery screen frieze in Winchester Cathedral, where Classical motifs were set amidst volutes - these too were originally classical pieces, though originally used as consoles or supportive brackets rather than in a non-functional, decorative guise[14] - with the whole design given a rinceaux-like appearance. *Rinceaux*, yet another geometric form widely used in decorative contexts, were ultimately derived from Classical sources although, in the context of early sixteenth century work, rinceaux were just as likely to be derived from Gothic illuminated manuscripts.

This last reminds us that while the new style was applied onto, and on top of, pre-existing work and ideas, it did not completely supplant the Gothic in the same

13 The medallions at Hampton Court are perhaps the most visible of all Italianate work in England but have never been the subject of a specific and detailed academic enquiry. The best account remains Higgins 1894, Appendix II, p.201, and 191-97.

14 That said, I notice from my photographs of Classical sites in Turkey that volutes (or consoles as here the motif projects from the face of the structure in a bracket-like manner) appear amongst the metopes in friezes on temples and thus decorative additions that serve no practical purpose, see for example the temple on the sea front beside the harbour at Side.

way that Gothic had Romanesque. This was no revolution, but rather a turning of the wheel, a new fashion, a temporary frivolity, which soon enough faded away as something new came along to seize the imagination; in this instance, strapwork.

I have therefore tried to avoid using the term *grotesque* as much as possible because I consider the term to be inappropriate in the context of much of the work in Hampshire. Italianate and Classical seem to me to suggest a stronger familiarity with Classical sources than we can really substantiate for this work, although we might examine the possibilities for some of the later material. Using the word 'Renaissance' as a descriptive has some merit, but it does not offer any clue as to what strand or form of the style is being portrayed. *All'antica* thus seems a useful means of differentiating the style from Gothic work without being overly prescriptive.

Surveying the presence of the Renaissance in Hampshire

This dissertation is largely concerned with *all'antica* work in Hampshire but the discussion that follows seems to me to reflect accurately the wider picture across England. Pevsner's volume on Hampshire in the *Buildings of England* contains references to all the examples of Renaissance work across the county (he also used the term *all'antica*) that occur in architectural settings.[15] There are however some curious lacunae. While Pevsner mentions the Lisle tomb at Thruxton, incredibly he neglected both the (*all'antica*-styled) north face of this tomb and ignored the frieze on the tower.[16] Nonetheless, he can generally be relied upon to have noted the presence of Renaissance detail, even if occasionally his comments are somewhat over-brief.[17] There is no specific survey of church buildings in Hampshire similar to that produced by the RCHM for southeast Wiltshire.[18] Although there are general works

15 Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 31.

16 We can attribute the entry on Thruxton to Pevsner as the foreword to this volume makes it clear that David Lloyd's work encompassed the descriptions of '... Southampton and Portsmouth, and the towns and villages between and around them...', *Ibid.*,11; on Thruxton, *Ibid.*, 620-21.

17 An example of this is his two-and-a-half line entry for Calshot, where there is an *all'antica* plaque over the gate. This is not mentioned by Pevsner who declined to describe the fort because, 'No proper study has yet been made of this castle.' *Ibid*, 158.

18 RCHM 1987.

that explore the churches of Hampshire,[19] these tend to be more interested in medieval work, in particular with Romanesque and Gothic architecture, or with tombs and other works that pre-date the Tudors, for example tomb brasses.

Where Pevsner indicated the presence of Renaissance work, then the five-volume Victoria County History of Hampshire contains considerably more detail. These provide the main means by which the distribution of *all'antica*-work in Hampshire can be culled.[20] There are additionally some specialised publications which offer much on this topic, and I will consider these below when I examine the historiographical background to this enquiry.

Distribution of all'antica-*work in Hampshire*

The presence of an incredibly wealthy and fashion-conscious bishop could be said to have encouraged the early spread of *all'antica*-work in Hampshire but Richard Fox (bishop 1501-28) had wide-ranging tastes that included both mainstream Gothic work, as well as an interest in the rapidly evolving *all'antica* style. Fox's life and his patronage of the arts is described more fully below,[21] however it is important to recognise from the outset that in all probability it was his interest in *all'antica* that sparked a more widespread adoption of the style in Hampshire. There can be little doubt that Fox's taste for the style was trend setting, for he was followed by Priors Silkstede and Broke in their choices for decorative work in the cathedral, as well as by local gentry such as Lord Sandys and Sir John Lisle.

The largest group of work is within Winchester Cathedral. The earliest piece is probably the frieze in Langton's chapel, dating perhaps to before 1510. Thereafter there followed, in this possible sequence, volutes in Fox's chantry chapel, tomb renovations in the north presbytery arcade, Silkstede's stalls in the south transept, south presbytery screen, north presbytery screen (both dated 1525), then the

19 Green 1967 provided a general survey of Hampshire churches and offered a detailed analysis of various aspects such as tomb monuments and brasses; she mentions only the Pexall tomb at Sherborne St John omitting both the Lisle and Norton tombs.

20 Colin Platt's 1986 guide to medieval and Renaissance Britain offers a patchy survey: for example, he does not mention St Cross, Sherborne St John or Thruxton. Thurley 1993, 85-113, and offers a useful chapter on the introduction of the *all'antica* style but does not mention any of the Hampshire sites.

21 On Fox, see my Chapter 4, p. 102 ff.

mortuary chests on the presbytery screens,[22] and possibly concluding this sequence – Avington's triptych dated 1526.[23] At nearby Romsey abbey, there remains a reredos in a similar style that is probably of a similar date; this being the only *all'antica* work now surviving there.[24] None of the sixteenth century glass in the cathedral contains any *all'antica* detail but is Flemish in character. Most of this was probably in place before 1515.[25] Similarly the bulk of the architectural work carried out for Fox in the cathedral is Gothic (Tudor court style), with little trace of *all'antica*.

Outside the cathedral, the most important Hampshire work is Fox's stallwork with frieze at St Cross. With Angela Smith, I argued that this may have been created around 1517.[26] The style of the St Cross work is close to that of the stalls erected for Cardinal d'Amboise at his château of Gaillon; he died in 1510, and it is possible that the St Cross work is much earlier than we suggested.[27]

The St Cross stalls seem to have had little impact in Hampshire, for there are no sprawling putti or fantastic creatures, such as the dolphins and cranes that are such a striking feature of the frieze, to be found amongst *all'antica* work elsewhere in the county. However, there is a strong possibility that the terracotta work, employed in the tombs made in this material across East Anglia, were in part based on the designs of the St Cross frieze, as here horned dolphins and fantastic birds similar to those at St Cross appear amongst the many motifs used. It is also possible that the St Cross frieze influenced Wolsey's choices for designs of terracotta work utilised in the fenestration work at Hampton Court. Wolsey was a close colleague and protégé of Fox's, and it seems highly probable that Wolsey would have seen and admired his friend's frieze at St Cross, although there is no specific record of his having done so.

The other major group of Renaissance work within one Hampshire building is that in Christchurch priory. Here, there are two chantry chapels: Margaret Pole's

22 The mortuary chests are something of an enigma in so much as they bear no reference to any donor; this is in stark contrast to all other work associated with Fox upon which some reference to Fox invariably appears.

23 On Avington's triptych, see Croft-Murray 1962, 23 and see figs 30 and 31.

24 *Ibid.* and fig. 29.

25 Angela Smith, pers. comm.; dating the glass is problematic as there is no documentary evidence describing when it was fitted.

26 The argument for this dating is laid out in Smith and Riall 2002.

27 The stalls at Gaillon are discussed in my Chapter 2. Fuller discussion of the dating of the St Cross stallwork is offered in my Chapter 6, p. 142 ff.

and Prior John Draper's; the latter carries an inscription with the date 1529. The Pole chantry is more difficult to date but on the basis of the style of its *all'antica* work it could be as early as 1520 but may well be as late as the 1539.[28] There is no documentary evidence for these structures. Less well known is the series of carved panels on the seat backs of the choir stalls and the profusion of end panels to the choir desks, all of which are carved in a medley of Renaissance work, but these were created with nothing of the style expressed at St Cross.[29]

Across Hampshire are three important tomb settings festooned with *all'antica* detail. These were created for leading members of Hampshire's gentry: the first, for Ralph and Edith Pexall, at Sherborne St John was probably erected in the early 1520s. This was followed by one for Sir John and Mary Lisle at Thruxton, created in the mid-1520s and which was enclosed by a decorative ambulatory chapel that was probably completed in 1527. In the 1530s followed another tomb, for the Norton family, at East Tisted. All of these tombs were executed in almost precisely the same style as the work in the presbytery in Winchester Cathedral, as was also Draper's chantry chapel of 1529 at Christchurch.[30]

The most outstanding Renaissance work in the county is the glass that is now at The Vyne, but most of which was originally created for the chapel of Holy Trinity, Basingstoke, in 1522-25.[31] Glass from the chapel was scattered, following damage to the chapel inflicted during the Civil War, and was re-set in widows at Mottisfont, Hampshire, from where some of it was moved to Woolbeding, Sussex, in the eighteenth century. Then, late in the nineteenth century, further sections of glass were returned to Basingstoke where it was installed in the parish church. Much of

28 On Margaret Pole, see Pierce 2004, but who does not discuss the chantry chapel beyond a brief mention of its existence.

29 The Christchurch stallwork is described and illustrated in Roberts 2000.

30 All of this work is discussed below in Chapter 13.

31 The chapel of the Holy Trinity was built onto the south side of the chapel of the Holy Ghost, both are now roofless ruins that stand in an open park just north of Basingstoke railway station. The glass has nothing of the Franco-Italian Gaillonesque style that underpins the *all'antica*-work at St Cross and the glass from The Vyne is much more in the tradition of the Flemish-Netherlandish north European evolution of Renaissance work though this too spread into France before arriving in England. The principal work on the Basingstoke glass is Wayment 1982.

this was lost when the town was bombed during the Second World War.[32] The Vyne has an important chapel, with a ground plan similar to that of the chapel of Holy Trinity, within which a suite of stallwork from the 1520s still remains. This has a frieze along the canopy, which is filled with Renaissance detail although the style of this work is very different to that of the St Cross frieze.[33] Within the house there is further, if rather limited, evidence of Renaissance work in the long gallery panelling.[34]

The next appearance of *all'antica*-work was the 1539 re-fronting of the choir stalls in the cathedral; these were followed by the construction *c.*1555 of Bishop Gardiner's chapel in the north presbytery aisle.[35] This has strong Classical overtones and displays little of the frivolity and fantasy of the St Cross frieze. Another frieze that was for a long time erected in Winchester College, but is now on display in the city's Westgate museum, may have been commissioned to celebrate the marriage of Philip and Mary in 1555 and this exhibits a late flourish of the *all'antica*-style.[36] At much the same mid-point of the sixteenth century, a series of tombs were built for the Paulets at Basing church, these exhibiting an early example of the introduction of strapwork.[37]

If this seems a meagre assemblage, when we look outside the county the story is not dissimilar; Wiltshire is seemingly devoid of any early Tudor Renaissance work, while in Dorset there are perhaps no more than three sites, although the work at Forde abbey is of more than local importance.[38] In Sussex much of the earliest work is largely confined to Chichester and the patronage of the bishop, Robert

32 Amongst the remaining glass is a fine portrait of a putto; this is illustrated in Riall 2004.

33 Tracy 1993, 241-42 and fig 17.13.

34 The terracotta medallion, allegedly depicting the Emperor Probus and which matches those at Hampton Court, was most likely to have been brought to The Vyne in the eighteenth-century; on which, see Howard and Wilson 2003, 130.

35 On the choir stall fronts, see Biddle 1993, 279-81; on Gardiner's chapel, *Ibid.*, 281-87.

36 The frieze is described in Lewis 1995; it was for many years 'lost' in Winchester college but was rescued in the 1990s, restored and conserved, and then placed on display in the Westgate museum, Winchester. Lewis believed that the frieze belonged with a series of painted panels from a ceiling created for John White who succeeded Gardiner as bishop of Winchester. For an alternative view, see Riall 2005.

37 A useful description of these tombs is given in VCH Hampshire **4**, 1911, 125-26, with a plate opp. p.126; and see also Pevsner 1967, 89. See also my Chapter 13 where I dismiss the idea that these tombs can be much earlier than mid-sixteenth-century.

38 RCHM Dorset, 1952, 240-47; Newman and Pevsner, 1972; and see Howard 1987.

Sherburne, for whom the painter Lambert Barnard executed murals and paintings in the cathedral and the bishop's houses.[39] This work all belongs to the 1520s and into the 1530s, and is of a very different style to that seen in Hampshire. Sherburne, like his Winchester colleague, ironically chose to be buried in a tomb that is entirely Gothic.[40] Sussex is notable for a series of Renaissance tombs such as those at Petworth and Racton, and also especially the elaborate de la Warr chantry chapel at Boxgrove. These all date to the 1530s and 1540s and are also in a very different idiom to the St Cross work and the *all'antica* tomb work across Hampshire.

In his survey of the glass at King's College chapel, Cambridge, Kenneth Harrison offered a distribution map that pinpointed the spread of Renaissance work across the country between 1505-1530. The bulk of the material is to be found in southern England. If we were to shorten the bracket to 1515-1525 this would remove the Devon material, on the basis that much of the Devon work is quite likely to be later in date,[41] and we would see that the fashion was seemingly confined to the southeast.[42] Harrison's work was published in 1952; we appear not to have moved forward very much in the intervening half-century.

In considering the spread of *all'antica* work across Hampshire there is a further aspect we must take into account: negative evidence. Of all the houses that Fox occupied as bishop, only Farnham castle (in Surrey) has survived relatively intact but the interior has been remodelled several times since, so that almost nothing remains from Fox's time.[43] Basing House, home to the Paulets whose tombs in the adjacent church have been noted above, was destroyed during the famous siege there during the Civil War. Parts of the brick-built house, belonging to the 1520s, once perhaps resembled the frontage of Hampton Court complete with a

39 On Lambert Barnard, see Croft-Murray 1956.

40 On Sherburne [or Sherborn, Sherbirne], see Harper-Bill 2004.

41 On Renaissance work in Devon, see Cherry and Pevsner, 1991, 47-48, and individual sites therein.

42 Harrison 1952, his map is on p.73.

43 VCH Surrey, 1902, **2**, 599-605; and see Thompson 1960. Fireplace surrounds with Fox's initials survive in the now ruined keep (although his initials have now vanished owing to weathering) these indicative of the work Fox had carried out here.

rather fine stone-cut sculpture of a Roman emperor set within a medallion covered in *all'antica* motifs.[44]

Probably the biggest loss was the destruction of the monastic houses following the Reformation. The great churches of these corporations had for centuries been the preferred burial place of both the aristocracy and the gentry, quite apart of course for members of the clergy. We can point to Thetford where members of the Howard family, the dukes of Norfolk, were buried in tombs styled in the Renaissance manner. These tombs were dismantled after the Reformation and moved to Framlingham where they were re-erected in the parish church, although sections of the original stonework for one of these was left abandoned at Thetford, there to be discovered in archaeological excavations in the twentieth century.[45] In all of this there is no mention of domestic interiors created for the middle or mercantile classes, although here too the problem of survival of the buildings in their entirety or having retained early sixteenth-century interiors is no less acute.

Historians and all'antica *in Hampshire – topographical and general surveys*

Winchester has never been far from the history books. Capital of Wessex, home to King Arthur's round table, sometime capital of England, the setting for both royal and episcopal castles and palaces set amongst a group of monastic corporations that occupied more than one quarter of the city, this was the stage for events of national importance, many of which found their way into the historical record from the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* onwards.[46]

Descriptions of the fabric of the buildings within which these events occurred are less easy to come by and it is not until the eighteenth century that detailed historical surveys, that included architectural details, began to appear; these

[44] The medallion is displayed in the on-site museum at Basing House; the only publication in which I have noted this medallion is the guide-book to the site. It deserves a wider audience.

[45] The Howard tombs are described in Marks 1984. Stonework from the tomb is now held in the Norfolk museum service stores at Gressinghall, Norfolk and a corbel is on display in the British Museum.

[46] For a useful introduction to Winchester, see James 1997.

illuminated by line drawings that swiftly became exceptionally accurate.[47] We can however point to earlier written descriptions that, with the benefit of hindsight, offer insights that would otherwise be unsustainable. Thus Lieutenant Hammond's description of Winchester Cathedral, written before the Civil War, mentioning the presence of the mortuary chests in the presbytery, is an important reference to their being present in the cathedral, even if his description cannot be used to identify these chests as Renaissance work.[48]

It was the arrival of accurate line drawings and engravings amongst written descriptions late in the eighteenth century that transformed these productions. However, we can also remark upon the almost immediate divide between general local histories, such as John Milner's history of Winchester,[49] that were accompanied by relatively few illustrations, and specialised single-subject volumes that were profusely illustrated, for example John Carter's *Specimens of the Ancient Sculpture and Painting in England* of 1792.[50] Carter's work was paralleled by work that explored architecture, such as Jacob Schnebbelie's survey and drawings made in 1788 of the leper hospital, St Mary Magdalene, on the outskirts of Winchester.[51] Schnebbelie's work was considerably more accurate than that of more traditional artists such as S. Hooper, whose engravings of Wolvesey palace, published in 1783, are very imprecise if artistically pleasing.

The transition from artistic representations of buildings to technically exact drawings was soon accomplished. Amongst the earliest drawings of St Cross is one produced in 1819, this contains vital information concerning the presence of the

47 The writings of the early historians of Winchester cathedral from the medieval period through to the mid-nineteenth-century are examined in Crook 2003; Crook does not make any mention of 'Renaissance' or *all'antica* work in this discussion, although he does examine wider attributions of style.

48 On Hammond's description, see Quirk, 1953, 9-15; on the mortuary chests, see Biddle 1993, 275-78.

49 The first edition of Milner's *History and survey of the antiquities of Winchester* appeared in 1798-9, in two volumes; there were a number of later editions and reprints.

50 John Carter's drawings originally appeared as a part work with that on St Cross included in No. 22 in the series. His work was re-edited and reproduced as a second edition in 1838, and it is this edition, which has been used here, alongside his original sketches that are now in the British Library, BL Add MS 29928 ff. 114 – 130.

51 This building was demolished soon afterwards. Schnebbelie's drawings are now in the library of the Society of Antiquaries of London; his drawing of St Mary Magdalen is reproduced in Riall 1994, fig 12.

frieze in the chancel of the church.[52] The drawing appeared in Britton's *Chronological History of English Architecture* of 1819,[53] an early example of the genre and which included the church of the Hospital of St Cross by reason of its importance as an early example of Gothic architecture alongside some remarkable late-Romanesque work.[54] The frieze is not described in this text. John Milner, in his magisterial survey of the history and antiquities of Winchester, first printed in 1798-9, mentioned the frieze in passing and remarked that it belonged to the reign of Henry VIII – a deduction based on the presence of Bishop Fox's pelican device rather than the quality or style of the carving.[55]

The word 'Renaissance' does not appear in Milner's work in connection with either St Cross or the cathedral, nor indeed does it appear as a descriptive term until late in the nineteenth century. In the intervening years we have valuable descriptions of St Cross by Charles Ball in 1818, by Robert Mudie in 1838 whose description was accompanied by some useful engravings, and then in John Duthy's work of 1839.[56] Can we see in this omission some sense of disapproval of the style, a reaction in the nineteenth century to the development of architecture with its austere, Classical lines that would be brushed aside with the re-introduction of Gothic through the work of architects such as Pugin, Scott and Shaw, for whom Neo-Gothic was all? Even Carter seems to have regarded Renaissance work with disinterest, drawing the pedant figurines and medieval sculpture in the church while ignoring the frieze;[57] certainly he never did include any Renaissance work in his extensive series of drawings.[58] It is ironic that the figurines were and are inextricably

52 Drawn by Porden and engraved by Le Keux, the drawing is discussed below in some detail, see Chapter 6.

53 John Britton had produced in 1817 his *Cathedral Antiquities* which included engravings by Edward Blore, these, as Crook 2003 p.237 noted, remain amongst the best views of the cathedral yet created.

54 On the architecture of St Cross, Kusaba 1989, and notes therein.

55 Milner's comments are examined in greater detail in my discussion of the frieze at St Cross, see Chapter 6.

56 Ball 1818, 229; Mudie 1838, 1 and 97 and see the plate opp. p. 97; Duthy 1839, 286.

57 These are described by Carter and Milner, as by subsequent writers, as corbel figurines. This seems to me to be quite wrong. A corbel should be seen as a supportive architectural element, the figurines are suspended from the frieze and support nothing: pendent seems a better description.

58 Carter 1838 (but original publication was 1890) and BL Add MS 29928 ff 114-130. The text accompanying Carter's drawings of St Cross was written by Milner. Carter's journey

a part of the frieze, a counter-point to the strongly Renaissance profile medallions that appear above them. It was not until Bernard Woodward's 1860 volume on the history of Winchester that the frieze was described as Renaissance.[59] The architect William Butterfield evidently considered a Renaissance frieze inappropriate in a Gothic setting as he had the frieze (and the stalls beneath) broken up and removed from the chancel.[60]

A similar story can be seen in the descriptions of the cathedral. An exemplar of the situation here can be discerned in the manner that Silkstede's stallwork in the south transept was described by early writers. First mentioned by Thomas Warton in 1760 and described by Milner in the 1790s, the first reasonably detailed description appeared in Ball's account of 1818, although this makes no mention of the artistic style in which the work was carved.[61] The stallwork also appeared in two illustrations of the south transept that appeared before 1820, but neither reveals any *all'antica* detail.[62] In was not until the later twentieth century that a description of this work, which paid attention to its art-design, appeared.[63] Of funereal monuments, such as the tombs at Sherborne St John and Thruxton,[64] there was no serious description until the writing of the Victoria County History of Hampshire brought these monuments to a wider audience. Here these works were seen and described as Renaissance, and associated with both the local context of the church they were sited

through Hampshire included Christchurch but he drew none of the Renaissance features there either.

59 Woodward 1860, 225.

60 On Butterfields's murals, see Abbott 2001. Butterfield was equally contemptuous of the seventeenth-century baroque work that was created to fit out the chapel of Winchester College. Spurning this suite of work as 'unfitting', Butterfield created a new set of stalls and other furnishings though these in turn were replaced by Caroe in 1913-21. The baroque work was returned in the later twentieth-century, and fitted into the New Hall; on which, see Pevsner in Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 700-706.

61 This point is somewhat emphasised when we notice that Ball noted there were presses at St Cross that were similar in design to Silkstede's work in the cathedral but which he gave no indication as to which style they were carved in; Ball 1818, 226.

62 See below, Chapter 10 and see Riall 2003b.

63 Jervis 1976. Silkstede's stalls are discussed in Riall 2003 and see below in Chapter 10.

64 A description of the tombs in Thruxton church appeared in 1853 (the semi-anonymous CEL in *Topographer and Genealogist*, 2, 306-311) but this concentrated on identifying who amongst the Lisles was buried where, their heraldry and family connections rather than being descriptive of architectural style. In the penultimate paragraph of this note is a reference to the '... cornice in an arabesque style ...' on the tower. I examine this site in some detail below, pp. 352-65.

within and connected with the history of the family for whom they were built, even if this history dwelt more on detailing the lines of family succession than in describing the wider political context.

If Renaissance was an expression that was hardly used in connection with any work in Hampshire until the mid-nineteenth century, the term *all'antica* did not appear until the mid-twentieth, when Anthony Blunt used it in connection with his seminal paper on the Renaissance work in Winchester cathedral.[65] Biddle, by contrast, avoids using *all'antica* as a descriptive, instead relying upon 'Italian details', 'classical ornament', 'Renaissance detail' and 'Franco-Italian' to describe the various monuments in the cathedral.[66]

We have no absolute idea as to what Bishop Fox and his contemporaries in England called the style, as the documentary record concerning the work is largely silent. Simon Thurley, in his chapter on *Style and Form* in his study of the royal palaces of Tudor England, observed that the word 'antique' began to appear amongst the records of the Revels department from 1516 onwards, though he felt that even by 1513 there was a change in the vocabulary of the department that reflected a change in the taste and style of their work.[67] This was however a decade later than in France where, as we have seen, the account rolls for the work at Gaillon make it clear that their compliers could describe the Renaissance work executed for Cardinal d'Amboise as 'antique' work.[68]

Subject specialisation and specialised surveys

The last time that a broad, multi-disciplinary approach to study of the Renaissance in England was attempted occurred at the turn of the nineteenth-twentieth century, when Reginald Blomfield in 1897 and John Gotch in 1901 produced their general

65 Blunt 1969. It is clear from references in both Croft-Murray 1962, 22, and Whinney 1964, introduction, that Blunt had seen and commented on the work in Winchester cathedral long before his 1969 paper appeared.

66 Biddle 1993, 257 *et seq*. Biddle's and Blunt's comments are discussed further below in connection with various aspects of the work within the cathedral.

67 Thurley 1993, 86 and n.14.

68 The Gaillon accounts were transcribed and published along with a substantial introduction by A. Deville in 1850. The relevant accounts are discussed above in Chapter 2; and see also Appendix 1.

surveys. These included details of buildings, church monuments and internal fittings alongside an historical narrative. No modern work as comprehensive, or as profusely illustrated, has appeared in print since then, although James Lees-Milne provided a wide-ranging survey in 1951. This is marked both by his prejudices and by his multifarious omissions. The difficulty for Lees-Milne was that the application of Renaissance motifs to architectural settings in the early Tudor period was quite simply un-Classical, and, as such, apparently beneath regard. His case is hardly helped by an ambivalent attitude to the first Renaissance in France where Gothic and Renaissance styles were mixed in a medley that, as he saw it, was quite uncouth. We may now also, with the benefit of hindsight, wonder at the possible antipathy with which Lees-Milne held the French soon after a war in which the French themselves were perceived as having done little to help the war effort.[69] Maurice Howard offered an over-view in his more general survey of the English country house but his work is not comprehensive.[70] This lack of detailed surveys of the early Tudor Renaissance, and academic attitudes to it, were high-lighted in the 2003-04 exhibition at the V & A, which seemingly re-branded the Renaissance as Gothic and in which the word *Renaissance* was significant as much for its omission as a term in the exhibition catalogue, as it was for its ironic, and considerable, presence amongst the exhibits.[71]

The twentieth century saw a rapid development of specialisation within individual disciplines and this was accompanied by specialist publications. These were also periodised, so that frequently a political framework demarcates these studies, which, as Philip Lindley points out, is artistically meaningless.[72] Thus to study Renaissance work in a locality such as Hampshire requires the researcher to embrace a range of disciplinary sources – painting, sculpture, architecture and now

[69] Lees-Milne also inserted a barely coded attack on the French by describing the wars of invasion into Italy launched by Louis XII and Francis I as little more than a frivolous excuse to plunder that country of its art treasures. In the context of the times, did Lees-Milne mean to infer by this a parallel to be drawn between the sixteenth-century activities of the French and the twentieth-century activities of the Germans?

[70] Howard 1987.

[71] For the exhibition catalogue, see Marks and Williamson 2003; the Renaissance aspect of this exhibition is reviewed in Riall 2004.

[72] Lindley 1997, 78, where Lindley notes the absence of a volume in the *Oxford History of Art* which should have covered the period 1461-1553, but which never appeared.

including archaeological reports[73] – but in each of these surveys there is little attempt to place the works described into their wider setting. So it is that Croft-Murray described the triptych now at Knole: this was commissioned for John Avington and was presumably displayed originally in the cathedral.[74] That the piece has a contextual import within the cathedral is obvious, less so is the nature of the script executed on the panels, and the connection this has with the presbytery screens, and the wider application and use of this style of lettering. Croft-Murray's book title shows that his survey starts at 1537 (why that date, unless to give a sense of symmetry to the fuller title of 1537-1837?),[75] Margaret Whinney's survey of sculpture starts at 1530, as does Sir John Summerson's survey of architecture in Britain.[76] Whinney offers little for the cathedral, nothing on St Cross, and anything else of Renaissance work in Hampshire is ignored, aside from a brief mention of the two chantry chapels at Christchurch; one can but wonder why the stallwork there called for no comment. Stranger still is that Whinney included a long description of the Marney and Bedingfeld tombs, in terracotta, alongside some comments on the use of terracotta in architectural settings such as at Layer Marney and at Sutton Place, but ignored the possibility of the connections between the Winchester Cathedral screens and the Draper chantry. Whinney's work pre-dated Nikolaus Pevsner's 1967 volume of *The Buildings of England* on Hampshire and which offered the first reasonably accessible survey of Renaissance work across the county.[77] But why did Whinney not lean more heavily on the ideas then currently being expressed by Anthony Blunt or

[73] Four of the most significant pieces of Renaissance work in Hampshire have been primarily published in archaeological journals: Wayment 1982 on glass from The Vyne in *Archaeologia*; Lewis 1995 on the Winchester College frieze and ceiling in *Proceeding of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*; Smith and Riall 2002 on the St Cross frieze in *Antiquaries Journal* and Riall 2003 on Silkstede's frieze also in *Proceeding of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society*.

[74] Croft Murray 1962, 23 and plates 30 and 31. The import of the painting is discussed in Biddle 1993 who shows their relevance in a Winchester context; and see below, Chapter 5.

[75] It is true that Croft-Murray does in fact look back to the period before 1537 in his survey but his coverage can hardly be described as much other than minimal.

[76] Whinney 1964; Summerson 1993.

[77] All of the buildings described by Pevsner also appear in the volumes of VCH, albeit seen, judged and described by Pevsner somewhat differently of course.

draw upon John Harvey's *English Medieval Architects* first published in 1954?[78] This too contains references to Renaissance work in Hampshire and, as a result of Harvey's work, established the possibility of an English architect and sculptor who worked in the *all'antica* style – Thomas Bertie.[79] Did Whinney simply build on the work of Blomfield and Gotch, both of whom made considerable reference to terracotta work, but without exploring the wider application of Renaissance work in Hampshire? Even if the *all'antica* work of the tombs at Sherborne St John and Thruxton were not considered to be of more than local interest, then surely the effigies ought to have commanded wider interest if only because there are so few such pieces of sculpture from the 1520s, the point regarding survival, or rather its lack thereof, that Whinney herself makes.[80]

Architectural surveys offer little more. Summerson made some comments on the period immediately prior to 1530, but these are in the main concerned with larger buildings such as Hampton Court and Sutton Place.[81] This would not matter if more specialised studies covered the ground through specific surveys of individual sites, such as the number of papers that explore Westminster abbey and, in particular, Henry VII's chapel;[82] or studies of Bath abbey or of King's college chapel, Cambridge.[83] But Richard Fox's full programme of work in Winchester Cathedral has never been fully explored and set in context with his political and ecclesiastical career, so that while aspects of his building works have been described, there remains much that has so far been ignored.[84] Similarly, Robert Sherburne's

78 Both Croft-Murray and Whinney acknowledge a debt to Anthony Blunt for his comments on Renaissance work, and its connections to French exemplars, in their work although Blunt himself did not publish anything on this until 1969.

79 Harvey 1954, 32-33; Harvey suggests the *all'antica* work was produced by foreign craftsmen but his biographical survey enables those of us following in his footsteps to benefit from his collation of much important material relating to individual craftsmen such as Thomas Berty; I describe Thomas Bertie and his work in detail below, see Section three.

80 Whinney 1964, xxi and 1; see now also Lindley 1997, 77.

81 Summerson 1993.

82 On Henry VII's chapel, see the essays in Tatton-Brown and Mortimer 2003.

83 Mention can be made here of the *History of the Kings Works*, Colvin 1965, which partially explored the activities of Fox's mason, Thomas Bertie [Bertie], in the building of artillery forts along the Solent. His activities are discussed in detail below.

84 Fox's full patronage of the arts and architecture is explored in Angela Smith's doctoral dissertation, Smith 1988. But there is no architectural description here of the chantry chapel or of the presbytery aisles and their vaults, nor of the proposed re-development by

ecclesiastical career has not been considered alongside his art patronage.[85] Additionally, there is no full description or architectural survey in print of either the Pole or Draper chantry chapels.

One exception to this was Anthony Blunt's groundbreaking but brief discussion of 1969, in which he explored the impact of the French *all'antica* style in English contexts.[86] Blunt saw the English work from a French perspective, very likely his French-published paper was finally written while he was engaged in working on his survey of French architecture, which followed in 1973, although it is clear he had expressed an opinion some years earlier.[87] This enabled Blunt to see the English work in a different light and to make very positive connections between works in England with sites in France. It was a novel approach that did not question the authenticity of the style, nor deride its lack of Classical understanding, but saw it for what it was; a new style that was happily superimposed upon pre-existing architectural concepts. For Blunt, and for more recent French art-historians, such as Jean Guillaume and Evelyne Thomas,[88] the first French Renaissance was not about the purity of the language of the style, nor about the Classicism of the application but was about a growing awareness and a love for Italianate style amongst French patrons of the earlier sixteenth century, no matter how it was applied.

Lees-Milne was contemptuous of the finials and tourelles, amongst other features, at Gaillon;[89] but these were and remained a mainstay of French architecture, and thus clearly acceptable to patron and mason alike, for at least four decades. Blunt saw this development in England, the application of a new fashion for

Fox of the transepts and, for reasons that still remain unclear to me, no discussion of Fox's frieze at St Cross.

85 On Sherburne, see Harper-Bill 2004; he was bishop of Chichester from 1508-1536 and was in Rome on a number of occasions from 1496 onwards conduction diplomatic missions for the Crown. As noted above, Sherborne employed the artist Lambert Barnard who created a number of art works in a Renaissance style including an interesting set of female worthies for the episcopal palace at Amberley; on which see Croft-Murray 1962, 24-5 and 154.

86 Blunt 1969, this article placed on record work that Blunt had clearly been concerned with earlier, as Croft-Murray noted Blunt's interest in and observations about the Renaissance in Winchester Cathedral in his 1962 *Decorative Painting in England.*

87 As I have mentioned above, both Whinney and Croft-Murray acknowledged Blunt's comments in their work of 1964 and 1962 respectively.

88 Both contributed to a 1994 conference on the Renaissance with their papers later appearing in Guillaume 2003.

89 Lees-Milne 1951, 9.

decoration to a native style that was itself also developing and evolving, as completely consistent with fashion even if the style, *per se*, was lacking in Classical qualities. Blunt's pioneering work, for it can be described as such, was not followed up until 1993, when Martin Biddle produced a detailed survey of the impact of the Renaissance on the fabric of Winchester Cathedral.[90] His description is concerned exclusively and inclusively with the cathedral, there is no reference here to *all'antica* works across Hampshire – one especially noticeable omission being the frieze at St Cross.

Church furnishings, and fixtures and fittings in wood have commanded a limited but detailed press, although many of these date from the early twentieth century.[91] That said, these mainly relate to medieval works and while some of the Renaissance-styled work is mentioned, this is often less detailed than those descriptions of medieval work. The recent volumes by Charles Tracy exploring church stallwork, tail off at the end of the medieval period. While he discusses the stalls in King's College Chapel in some detail, he omits discussion of the much earlier woodwork at Christchurch and St Cross.[92] All of this echoes Christopher Wilson's lament that studies of parochial churches have, in recent times, become increasingly rare.[93] Churches, church architecture, and more especially church fittings now rarely attract detailed academic study.

Finally, there is the contribution of archaeology, although we have to note that final reports on archaeological excavations can take a long time to emerge.[94] Nevertheless, it is from archaeological work that one area of Renaissance work in early Tudor England is becoming better understood. This is terracotta used in

90 Biddle 1993.

91 See for example Francis Bond, 1908, *Screens and Galleries in English Churches*, (London) who covers Renaissance screens in just four pages of the 181 pages of text and illustrations. He did however point to the existence of many screens across Devon, but did not make any mention of the frieze (or screen) at St Cross.

92 Tracy 1987 and Tracy 1990.

93 Wilson in Marks and Williamson 2003, 119, n.19.

94 Martin Biddle's excavations in Winchester, which concluded in 1972, are mostly still unpublished although a series of volumes has begun to emerge; Thurley's 2003 *Hampton Court*, reveals that almost all the major excavations on the palace remain unpublished with many of these completed more than twenty years ago. When I left the Canterbury Archaeological Trust in 1977 following the conclusion of the eighteen-month long excavation I directed at Highstead, I left a draft text of the report on those excavations. This too remains unpublished.

architectural settings. The recent excavation of St John's Clerkenwell, and the prompt publication of those excavations there, shows the contribution archaeological excavation can make to our understanding of the fashion for both architectural terracotta and the *all'antica* style.[95]

Transmitting the style

Gotch and others commentators at the end of the nineteenth century thought that the presence of a substantial Italian community in Southampton might have influenced the early spread of the style in the county. Sir John Summerson suggested that stonemasons followed the importation of stone from Normandy, the implication being that they brought with them the new style.[96] John Harvey thought much the same for he ascribed the Renaissance work on the Winchester Cathedral screens to foreign craftsmen.[97] As we shall see, I reject the latter interpretation. But the fact that foreign artists and craftsmen such as Torrigiano (who was working at Westminster abbey) and da Maiano (he was conceivably creating terracotta medallions for Wolsey's Hampton Court somewhere in the vicinity), as well as the presence of Flemish artists, for example the glassmakers Barnard Flower and Galyon Hone and the painter Lambert Barnard,[98] reminds us that foreigners were indeed working in England in this period on some of the most prestigious projects underway.

For some observers, an explanation can be found in travellers to the Continent who brought back both portable art works and their own visual experiences that were then realised in new work. Thus for example, Robert Sherburne's experience at the Papal court might underlie his adoption of Renaissance work at Chichester and his employment of Lambert Barnard.[99] Alternatively, Richard Weston whose travels in France included time spent along the Loire where he might have seen the châteaux at Amboise, Bury and Blois with these

95 On the Clerkenwell excavation, see Sloane and Malcolm 2004, which I have reviewed for *Renaissance Studies* and for *Medieval Ceramics*, Riall forthcoming.

96 Summerson 1993 (1953 1st ed), 31.

97 Harvey 1984, 33.

98 Flower and Hone both painted glass at King's College, Cambridge; on the glass here, see Wayment 1972.

99 On Lambert Barnard at Chichester, Croft-Murray 1962, 23-25, 153-55. On Sutton Place, see Howard 1987, 129.

inspiring the design for his own house at Sutton Place.[100] The source for the style that is the most frequently cited is by reference to individual prints or to books and manuscripts. Such is the explanation suggested for the work at Boxgrove priory, where the chantry chapel of Thomas, Lord de la Warr, is decorated with images drawn from French book of hours.[101] While this might explain some of the Biblical imagery, it says nothing at all about the *all'antica* work.

The correlation between paintings and prints and work executed in both carved woodwork and on glass has long been recognised, particularly so in the case of printed editions of the Bible where woodcut illustrations were often used to supply a design for derivative work. An interesting example of this connection is the work on the misericords in St George's chapel, Windsor. In a detailed paper exploring these, Malcolm Jones examines the probable source of the imagery that was used for the designs alongside the realisation of these executed on individual misericords.[102] While the parallels are impressive, in no one case does the misericord reflect an exact copy.

A more persuasive case can be made linking the engravings of three Italian artists to carvings executed for Cardinal d'Amboise at Gaillon, all of them were greatly influenced by the work of Mantegna and they include Zoan Andrea, Antonio da Brescia and Nicoletto da Modena. There seems to be little doubt that the carvings were executed at Gaillon itself and it is plain is that there is a remarkable degree of correspondence between the engravings and the woodwork.[103] Is this an exception, one that we should remember was perhaps influenced by the fact that Cardinal d'Amboise was acquainted with northern Italy, and was moreover aided in his ambition to create a fashionable house by the presence of his nephew, Charles, in Milan where he was the French military governor and who actively sought artists and materials on his uncle's behalf? As will become clear, the frieze at St Cross is strikingly similar to work at Gaillon, but it is neither a copy nor is it of the same quality. While it is possible to suggest that prints, or drawings, provided the means

100 On Weston's house at Sutton Place, see Howard 1987 and see also Blunt 1969.

101 On Boxgrove, Howard 1987, 130; the attribution to French books of hours was made by Cave in a two-page note published in *Archaeologia* **85**, 1936, 127-28.

102 Jones 2002, 155-65.

103 On these engravings, see Rieder 1977, 350-52; and see below p. 228 ff.

by which the ideas for the St Cross frieze were transmitted across the Channel, and there can be little doubt that it was from France and not Italy that the designs came, this appears to be a less than satisfactory explanation. Part of the problem is the degree to which fine details in the two sets of work match each other, detail that, it seems to me, could not realistically have been transmitted via prints. Did the craftsman (or men) come from France following d'Amboise's death? While this is a possibility, the quality of the St Cross work makes this questionable, but not completely inconceivable, if the carver was a junior or less able member of the original team at Gaillon. A further difficulty with suggesting a French (or foreign) carver is that subsequent work in the cathedral and elsewhere in Hampshire falls well below the quality of the work of the St Cross frieze, never mind the simple fact that the full design of the frieze was never apparently replicated, it is one of a kind. Did our putative carver go back to France or find himself employed on royal works in London, or working for Wolsey; perhaps the reason is more prosaic, simply, he caught the sweating sickness and he died.

Richard Fox was himself in France on a number of occasions, especially so in the 1510s when he accompanied Henry VIII's invasion in 1513-14 and he again accompanied his king to France in 1520 for the meeting on the field of the Cloth of Gold. Did his own experiences in France contribute to his desire to use *all'antica* as a style? The problem is explored further in my discussion of both Fox and of his frieze.[104]

While we can possibly ignore the presence of the new style in glass as a stimulus to a wider acceptance of *all'antica* - it did not appear until the late 1510s at Kings College chapel, Cambridge, and then the early 1520s in Basingstoke and at The Vyne - more can be said for furniture and panelling, such as the panelling from Waltham Abbey, and also for paintings. Furniture of this period is very rare and even less is written about it.[105] A case in point are the ap Thomas chairs in the Museum of Welsh Life, at St Fagans near Cardiff. These are thought to be of Welsh manufacture and to date to sometime after *c.*1505.[106] A remarkably similar chair was

104 See Chapter 4 and Chapter 6.

105 A useful overview of furniture is given in Chinnery 1979 and Morley 1999.

106 Griffiths 1993 and pers. comm.

auctioned at Southeby's in 2001.[107] Others are illustrated in Victor Chinnery's survey of oak furniture.[108] The quality of the work and the presence of *all'antica* motifs mean these pieces can hardly have emerged from a workshop in Wales. More likely, these chairs were made in France or the Low Countries, but it will probably take scientific analysis of the wood to make the case. These chairs and their analogues, alongside the Waltham Abbey panelling, indicate not only a higher level of acceptance of the fashion for *all'antica* than is immediately apparent, but also offers a route by which the full range of the style could readily be transmitted.

* * *

The central point to this chapter has been to show that the frieze at St Cross has largely been ignored in surveys of *all'antica*-work in Hampshire, and that a further three significant settings – Sherborne St John, Thruxton and East Tisted – have not been critically described and discussed. While it is now perhaps unlikely that any further stonework with *all'antica* detail remains to be discovered, there does remain the possibility that panel-work like the Winchester college frieze, or wall-paintings, may yet emerge. That so many settings should be missing from any serious survey of *all'antica* work in Hampshire must be a cause for surprise, and certainly should be seen as necessitating a re-assessment of the impact of the style in both Hampshire and in the wider context.

107 Item 1265 in Sotheby's 2001, 'Applied Arts, Country Furniture, Works of Art and Ceramics', Sussex. 19 and 20 June, 2001. I am much indebted to Hans-Christian Bowen for his assistance with my enquiries concerning this chair.

108 Chinnery 1979.

UNIVERSITY OF LIBRARY

Chapter 4:

Richard Fox 1447-1528: prelate, politician and patron of the arts

ANY DISCUSSION OF THE INTRODUCTION of the Renaissance style to architectural or artistic work in Winchester must inevitably lead to questions concerning its principal patron, Richard Fox.[1] Peter Gwyn noted in his biography of Thomas Wolsey that no new 'life' of Fox had been written since Edward Batten's introduction to the *Registers of Richard Fox, Bishop of Bath and Wells*.[2] Fox's letters were published in 1929, but it is a surprisingly thin volume for a man who held high political office for more than thirty years.[3] There is still no full-length biography of Richard Fox, however this is also true of most of his episcopal colleagues.[4]

This chapter explores the main themes of Fox's career and his patronage of the arts. My intention is to provide the political and ecclesiastical backdrop against which Fox's art patronage should be considered: it is specifically not intended to be an all-embracing biography.

1 This chapter is much indebted to Dr A J Smith's 1988 unpubl. PhD dissertation (Smith 1988a), together with the extensive discussions of Fox, his life and works that we shared while we researched our work on Fox's frieze at St Cross.

2 Gwyn 1990, 7. Gwyn appears to have been unaware of Angela Smith's 1988 doctoral dissertation as he makes no reference to her work.

3 90 letters are reproduced in this volume but of these only 47 were sent by Fox, the remainder being letters sent to him; see Allen and Allen 1929; hereafter referred to as Letters.

4 A short biography is included in the Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004, written by C S L Davies; he too appears to have written without being aware of Angela Smith's dissertation as he does not cite her work in his bibliography; *c.f.* Woolfson 2003, 8, n.3.

Early life

Details of Fox's early life are very sketchy. He was born at Ropsley in Lincolnshire in 1447-8 and, after schooling in Grantham, he went to Oxford.[5] His name does not appear in any register, but it is possible he first attended St Mary Hall *c.*1470 and then Magdalene College.[6] Following an outbreak of plague, he apparently left Oxford to go to Cambridge, where he completed his undergraduate studies.[7] The first notice of Fox records his ordination as an acolyte at Salisbury cathedral;[8] this prebend was linked to the parish church at Grantham.[9] By this time it is quite probable he was studying at the University of Louvain where he studied canon law.[10] It is possible that Fox returned to England in *c.*1480 when he received the canonry of Bishopstone in Salisbury cathedral;[11] this did not require Fox to be domiciled in Salisbury and it may be that in this period he attended the University of Paris. Equally, he might have remained in England until Buckingham's failed rebellion in 1483, and then fled to France.[12] The Bishop of London appointed Fox vicar of Stepney sometime around 1484;[13] Richard III complained about this in a

5 Fox's earliest biographer was Thomas Greneway, who was president of Corpus Christi College 1562-68, and upon whom most later writers rely for the early details of Fox's life; see the original DNB entry and Davies 2004.

6 Later in life, Fox gave employment to graduates of this college along with extensive gifts, which perhaps suggests that Fox studied there. Fox's earliest biographer was Thomas Greneway, who was president of Corpus Christi College 1562-68, and upon whom most later writers rely for the early details of Fox's life; see the original DNB entry and Davies 2004.

7 Batten 1889, 6, notes the tradition recited by the president of Corpus Christi college, Oxford, in the mid-sixteenth-century that Fox went to Boston grammar school, Magdalene, Oxford and completed his undergraduate studies at Pembroke college, Cambridge.

8 Easter Sunday 1477, Davies 2004 shows this was 5 April 1477 and that Fox then held the degree of BCL though from which university is not known.

9 *Ibid.* Ropsley is about six miles east of Grantham.

10 He matriculated in July 1479. Smith 1988a, 63. See however Davies 2004, who suggests Fox did not stay long at Louvain.

11 In one of many small ironies resulting from Fox's peripatetic career he would return to Bishopstone as lord of the manor when he became bishop of Winchester – this manor forming part of the episcopal estate.

12 Griffiths and Thomas, 1985, 101, note that Richard III was convinced by January 22, 1484/5 that Fox was indeed with Henry Tudor.

13 Batten thought that the entry in the bishop of London's register was possibly inserted after Fox had been appointed, Batten 1889, 4.

letter of 22 Jan 1484/5, because Fox was then with the rebel *Henrico ap Tudder*.[14] At about this same time Fox was brought to the attention of Henry Tudor, to whose cause he was soon recruited, becoming one of his closest advisors.[15]

Royal servant

It is likely Fox was present at the battle of Bosworth (22 August 1485).[16] He was appointed a member of the king's council soon after the battle and remained also Henry's secretary. In January 1487 he was appointed Bishop of Exeter.[17] Fox never visited the see, relying instead upon others to undertake his episcopal duties for him.[18] Fox was probably a permanent member of Henry VII's household at this time, deeply involved in managing the country and, along with Cardinal Morton (*d.* 1500),[19] in the direction of foreign affairs. Fox may also have served as the king's personal chaplain, as he was noted as taking services and saying masses prior to undertaking the business of the day.[20]

Early in 1487, Bishop Courtenay resigned the Privy Seal,[21] which was given to Fox.[22] Professor Chrimes described Fox's term of office as testifying '... to his outstanding abilities and resource, and marks him out as one of the principal builders of the early Tudor regime.'[23] Thus, in the autumn of 1487, Fox was despatched to Scotland to negotiate peace terms and arrange for a royal marriage

14 Allen and Allen, 1929, ixx; Davies 2004.

15 Chrimes 1999 (new ed), 34-5; and see also at 117-8, Fox's appointment to this office, and the subsequent holders – Oliver King, Robert Sherburne and Thomas Ruthall – appears to have marked the beginning of the rise in importance of this office, leading to it effectively becoming of 'ministerial' rank.

16 Griffiths and Thomas 1998, 134.

17 Fox was appointed bishop of Exeter in 1487, in succession to Peter Courtenay who was translated to Winchester, Batten 1889, 12. Davies 2004 says Fox was 'provided' on 29 January 1487.

18 Fox himself makes this clear in a letter he wrote to Wolsey, Letter 57, 30 April 1517; and see Smith 1988a, 72

19 On Morton, see Harper-Bill 2004. Morton, with Fox, was 'credited' with inventing the 'fork' by which it was possible to extract taxation money; see also Chrimes 1999 (new ed.) 203, and n.6.

20 Batten 1889, 9-11.

21 On Courtenay, bishop of Winchester (d. 1492), see the life by Rosemary Horrox, 2004. Courtenay succeeded Wayneflete as bishop on 29 January 1487.

22 Batten 1889, 11. Chrimes 1999 (new ed.), 109.

23 Chrimes, 1999 (new ed.), 116.

alliance between the two countries.[24] Fox was translated to become Bishop of Bath and Wells in 1492;[25] he never visited this see as its bishop either.[26] The birth of Prince Arthur was followed by proposals for a marriage between Arthur and Katherine of Aragon,[27] and Fox was appointed as the principal English negotiator working towards this marriage.[28]

Chrimes saw Fox as one of the outstanding personages of the realm, a man much trusted by Henry VII in all aspects of government.[29] Fox was soon abroad again. In late 1489 and early 1490, Fox was with an embassy in France, which was especially concerned with preserving the independence of Brittany.[30] The embassy met with limited success, for in the summer of 1492 England was briefly at war with France. Boulogne was besieged, and Fox found himself directly involved, first with the preparations for and execution of the warfare, and then in yet further peace negotiations which culminated with the treaty of Étaples.[31] In 1494, Fox was translated to Durham,[32] where his skills as a diplomat (Chrimes described Fox as Henry VII's 'ace negotiator')[33] were required in Henry VII's negotiations with

24 Batten 1889, 18; the other principal commissioner was Sir Richard Edgecumbe. This resulted in Margaret Tudor being married to James IV of Scotland (he died in battle against the English at Flodden in 1513) which would eventually lead to the Stuart accession to the English crown.

25 Davies 2004 gives the date of 8 February 1492 for Fox's translation.

26 Letter 57, 30 April 1517, Fox to Wolsey wherein Fox laments that fact that he never visited the sees of Exeter and Bath and Wells; Batten 1889, 12. Fox was elected bishop in succession to Bishop Stillington.

27 I have spelt Katherine's name with a K here as that is exactly as it was in her own time; on this usage see Riall 2004, 323. A noticeable example of the use of K can be seen on a boss in the vault over the presbytery in Winchester Cathedral where her initial K is linked with the H for Henry. There was nothing new about this marriage policy that attempted to link England and Spain as Edward IV had commissioned Thomas Langton to negotiate the marriage of his son to the Infanta Isabella in 1476-77, on which, see Wright 2004.

28 *CSP Sp* I, (1485-1509), p.164; and see Batten 1889, 21; Williams, 1973, 85; and Starkey 2004, 24.

29 Chrimes 1999 (new ed.), 116.

30 Davies 2004. Georges d'Amboise was also involved in this campaign, did the two men meet during this campaign or during the peace negotiations? It is probable that they may have done but the documentary evidence has thus far been elusive.

31 *Ibid.*, 23-4.

32 Davies 2004 gives the date as 30 July 1494. Fox succeeded Bishop John Shirwood whose library Fox either inherited or bought from his estate. Shirwood's books eventually formed a part of the library Fox donated to his Oxford foundation, Corpus Christi.

33 Chrimes 1999 (new ed.), 109.

Scotland for the marriage of Margaret to James IV.[34] Fox would become known as the Tudor marriage broker as it was he, more than any other, who would arrange the marriages for Henry VII's children, most notably arguing the case for Prince Henry's marriage to his brother's widow, Katherine.[35] At Durham, Fox undertook both the political role required of him by Henry VII, and for the first time, the episcopal role of a working bishop.[36]

Although Fox was credited with commissioning new water defences at Calais in 1490-1,[37] it was probably at Durham that Fox began to undertake any serious building works with a personal level of interest.[38] Fox probably also started to use his personal device, a pelican *vulning*, for the first time at Durham, as a signifier to show those building works that he patronised.[39] He remodelled the banqueting hall and kitchens at Durham Castle, where his pelican device and his motto, *Est Deo Gratia*,[40] can still be seen.[41]

While Bishop of Durham, Fox began a long-lasting association with Nicholas West who became Bishop of Ely in May 1515.[42] West gained various benefices

34 We may note that this period of diplomacy had its more aggressive moments as during one of the invasions of northern England by the Scots, Fox was himself besieged in his episcopal castle at Norham; for a short account of this incident in Fox's life, see Davies 2004.

35 On the wedding of Henry and Katherine, see Starkey 2004, 79-109.

36 In addition to his episcopal duties, Fox also held a military role both as an active field commander from his castle at Norham and as a builder of fortifications. He appears also to have advised on the upgrading of the defences at Berwick, on which see Fox's Letter 11 of 29 July 1500 to Darcy.

37 Davies 2004; Davies noted that Fox was in Calais from September 1492 until February 1493 and see Letter 57, 30 April 1517, to Wolsey in which Fox detailed his recollections of his own work there.

38 As Bishop of Bath and Wells, Fox had had the use of a country house at Dogmersfield (Hampshire) and it is conceivable that he might have had improvements made to the buildings there. The house provided accommodation for Katherine of Aragon and her entourage in November 1501, a choice that must surely have been influenced by Fox, as a 'neutral' location rather than using the bishop of Winchester's nearby castle-palace at Farnham. The medieval and Tudor house was razed to the ground in the eighteenth century although some features of the medieval estate survive, such as the fish ponds.

39 Smith 1988a, 74. As Fox was never at either Exeter or Wells, his pelican device does not appear on the fabric of either cathedral.

40 Translated by Biddle 1993, 270, who offered as his interpretation, '... 'God is Grace' or 'Grace is an attribute of God' rather than 'Thanks are to God'...'. I would prefer a more literal sense that suggests Fox's thanks for his accomplishments, thus 'I am what I am ... *Through the Grace of God*' would better serve the intent of the motto.

41 Pers. obs.

42 On Nicholas West, see Felicity Heal 2004, this is based on her PhD dissertation of 1972.

through Fox,[43] and was employed on a number of important delegations and embassies to the principal European courts, including the French and that of the Holy Roman emperor.[44] Like Fox, West commissioned work in the Renaissance style, the most important of which is his chapel in Ely Cathedral where the vault and the timpani in the doorway are filled with *all'antica* motifs, including many dolphins although none of these are horned.[45]

Bishop of Winchester

The marriage between Prince Arthur and Katherine of Aragon took place in London in November 1501. This was a grand affair with a major ceremonial entry into London by the royal party that was marked by a series of tableaux and presentations at various significant stages of their journey to St Paul's Cathedral. [46] Fox was closely associated with the arrangements for this ceremonial entry, which was fully intended to reflect—in art, music and drama—the standing of the Tudors as being on an imperial scale every bit as grand and prestigious as any other European monarch of the day.[47]

43 Amongst these benefices was the living at Witney – did West also have access to or use of the large episcopal house at Witney as well? It seems unlikely that Fox would have used the house himself.

44 West attended the wedding of Louis XII to Mary Tudor in 1514 and, early the following year, returned to France for Louis' funeral (12 January 1515) and to renew the defensive alliance that Louis had agreed with Francis I, Heal 2004. West was accompanied by Sir Richard Weston, another patron of *all'antica* work, on these embassies.

45 Pers. obs.

46 The ceremonial that surrounded this marriage is described in detail in *The Receyt of Lady Kateryne* in Kipling, G., ed, 1990. There is some thought that Fox wrote *The Receyt*, a view that Smith 1988a, 74, disputes. See also Kipling 1988.

47 Starkey 2004, 40-73. Wright, 2004, claims that Fox planned Katherine's itinerary from Plymouth to London; this seems unlikely when it is remembered Katherine was supposed to arrive at Southampton but was driven to land at Plymouth owing to stormy weather. Her journey must therefore have been planned quite literally on the hoof until she arrived at Amesbury Abbey, where she was met by the Earl of Surrey. Wight also claims that Fox did not plan the wedding pageants. Starkey 2004, 48-52, avoids the issue by referring to the planning as having been done by 'commissioners', although acknowledging Henry VII was very much a hands-on king.

A month earlier Fox had been translated for the fourth and final time, to Winchester. His predecessor was Thomas Langton who had died of the plague.[48] Fox combined this bishopric with political office (he was keeper of the Privy Seal – the term coming into use during Fox's tenure) and service to the king. Some writers have expressed surprise that Fox was not appointed Archbishop of Canterbury, following the successive deaths of Cardinal Morton (*d.* September 1500) and Thomas Langton, rather than Bishop of Winchester. It is said that Fox himself wanted the wealth of the see, rather than the prestige of being the metropolitan.[49] A further possibility is that Fox may have recognised that taking the primacy would have involved a diminution in his political life, which seems to have given him considerable satisfaction, and this was probably also something neither Henry VII nor Fox wanted. It may be noted that Warham became Chancellor as well as Archbishop of Canterbury, but it is not at all clear that Warham exercised any real political role in the way that Fox did.[50]

Political work continued unabated for Fox, and while the relative proximity of Winchester to London would have permitted him to take a much closer interest in the running of his see, it is clear from his own later comments that he did not do as much as he eventually felt he should have, as bishop, in his diocese.[51] This sense of under-achievement may well partially explain Fox's interest in creating a college at Oxford, a project that is discussed below.

Having master-minded the reception and preparations for the wedding of Arthur to Katherine, Fox would soon have been embroiled in the discussions concerning Katherine's future following the death of Prince Arthur; Fox was of the mind that she should marry Prince Henry and he worked to that end.[52] As 'lord privy seal', the term came into use during Fox's tenure,[53] Fox was involved in both the day-to-day running of the government and also in diplomatic initiatives

48 Langton was appointed bishop of Winchester in 1493, in succession to Peter Courtenay, on which see Wight 2004. Langton died on 27 January 1501 having been elected archbishop of Canterbury only a few days earlier.

49 Davies 2004.

50 On Warham, see Scarisbrick 2004.

51 See Fox's own comments on his lax rule expressed in Letter 52, dated 23 April 1516, to Wolsey; and see Letter 57, dated 30 April 1517, also to Wolsey; Woolfson 2003, 9.

52 Starkey 2004.

53 Davies 2004.

including trading negotiations. In 1507 Fox travelled to Calais for negotiations concerning the marriage of Henry VII's daughter Mary to Charles (later Charles V and Holy Roman Emperor).[54] Additionally, Fox was the leading figure amongst the executors of Henry VII's will, a reflection of his standing with the king who may well have regarded Fox as a friend in as much as anyone could be, and he would go on to become involved in the planning and execution of the king's wishes for a fitting tomb in Westminster Abbey, which would eventually lead to the employment of the Renaissance artists and sculptor, Pietro Torrigiano.

The Winchester episcopal estate

Fox was now bishop of the wealthiest episcopate in the land – perhaps one of the wealthiest in western Europe.[55] The episcopal estate extended from Southwark to Taunton in the west and from the south coast to Ivinghoe in Buckinghamshire (fig. 36). A well-established retinue of officers ran the estate, many of whom served successive bishops, with an administration based at Wolvesey palace in Winchester, and which utilised an accounting system very similar to that of the king.[56] The episcopal accounts provide an unparalled mass of evidence for the financial and social life of the bishop's manors. The series of rolls is incomplete and, significantly, does not include details of the bishop's personal spending that appears to have been accounted for separately.[57] Very few of these accounts have been transcribed and published, none of them from Fox's episcopate. Archaeologists in particular have mined these accounts when examining individual sites, for example John Hare's

54 On Mary Tudor, see Richardson 1970; Perry 1998; and Loades 2004.
55 Page 1996, ix.
56 *Ibid.*, 'Introduction', ix-xix.
57 *Ibid.*, xxiv.

work on Bishop's Waltham,[58] to demonstrate the progressive development and upkeep of these palaces.[59]

There were at least ten major houses or castles across the episcopal estate with many other smaller manor houses,[60] all of which were available to the bishop of the day to use as he chose.[61] Some of the castle sites had fallen into disuse by the sixteenth century and were becoming ruinous, such as the castles at Merdon (Hampshire) and Downton (Wiltshire), while some of the major houses, such as Highclere (Hampshire) and Witney (Oxfordshire) were little used, but incurred essential maintenance that continued to be paid for. When in London, Fox could use Winchester House in Southwark, conveniently sited on the south bank of the Thames and close to the main road leading for Surrey.[62] A short ride away from London was the brick built palace at Esher;[63] here Bishop Waynflete had created one of his two brick entry towers.[64] Esher and Farnham some miles to the west both lay beside extensive parklands, as did the palace at Bishop's Waltham,[65] and in these Fox entertained both Henry VII and Henry VIII and their entourages, with the fun of the chase being readily mixed with both politics and diplomacy. A superb gold and

58 The palace at Bishop's Waltham was excavated by Stuart Rigold in the late 1950s and early 1960s but his excavation work has not been published, see Riall 1994, and Riall 2003, 115-130; on the later medieval palace, see Hare 1987 and Hare, 1988, 222-54. None of these studies specifically explore work undertaken during Fox's episcopate.

59 An example of upkeep can be seen in the valuable information on the roof tile industry that the pipe rolls reveal from the early thirteenth century onwards, on which see Riall 1997, Riall 2003a and Riall in Poulton forthcoming.

60 Even the smaller manor houses are beginning to emerge from obscurity; see e.g. Roberts 2004, 180-195 for a description of the manor house at Hambledon, Hampshire.

61 There is no general overview of the bishop's estate and their buildings apart from a discussion of the situation in the mid-twelfth-century in Riall 1994; and see also Hare 1988.

62 Fox was associated with building works in St Mary Ovary, now Southwark Cathedral, which stands just to the east of Winchester House. Fox had a new great screen installed, it features his rebus of the pelican vulning, and added the upper stages to the tower; on this see VCH Surrey, 4, 1912, 155-56.

63 In Letter 71, dated 14 August 1519, Fox offers Wolsey the use of his palace at Esher for as long as Wolsey required it, this demonstrating that this palace was then very much in use; this was the period when Wolsey's building works at Hampton Court were in full swing, on which see Foyle 2003.

64 Apart from a brief description in VCH Surrey, 3, 1911, 448-49, little has been written about Esher. The sixteenth-century pipe roll accounts (including those covering the years of Fox's episcopate) have been lost.

65 Hampshire County Council, in one of those peculiarly but splendidly irrational decisions so beloved of English bureaucracy, decreed that all the place-names incorporating the possessive apostrophe would, in future, be spelt without this punctuation mark, thereby giving the impression that the place-name is the plural of bishop.

sapphire pin, discovered by a metal-detector user in 1992, lost from a princely or even a king's, hat speaks volumes of the quality of the huntsmen who rode in this park.[66]

The principal palace was Wolvesey, which stands just to the east of Winchester cathedral; this too was the administrative hub of the estate and here many of the officials who ran the estate also lived. This palace had been completed back in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries with little added by subsequent bishops, although Cardinal Beaufort had re-built the chapel.[67] Eleven miles south is Bishop's Waltham; this was another medieval castle but one that had been extensively modernised in the later fifteenth-century (fig. 37)[68] and was the setting for a number of major diplomatic gatherings.[69] The estate extended out to Somerset where a number of manors, that had long been held by the bishops, clustered around the castle at Taunton.[70]

Used is probably the key word here. Fox 'inherited' a group of houses which were apparently sufficient for his needs; the episcopal pipe rolls revealing that he spent very little money on building works beyond regular maintenance and limited modernisation, which included the creation of suites of rooms and the installation of fireplaces within pre-existing structures. This is certainly the case at Farnham where, presumably to accommodate a larger retinue, the old medieval keep was refurbished and a new suite of rooms, complete with fireplaces, was created.[71] What the pipe

66 Cherry 1997, 388-93; Graham 1999, 264-6. Following a bitterly acrimonious case, the pin was recovered from the treasure hunter by the local council, who then allowed it to be displayed in a museum, which had insufficient security to keep it safe. Unsurprisingly, the pin was soon stolen.

67 Biddle 1986. Martin Biddle substantially excavated the palace in the 1960s and early 1970s, although the excavation report remains as yet unpublished.

68 Hare 1987; Hare 1988; on the early work at this castle-palace, see Riall 2003c.

69 Biddle 2000, 425-32 describes the visit of Charles V to England in 1522, during which both Farnham and Bishop's Waltham were visited by the royal entourage.

70 Towards the end of his life Fox founded a grammar school in the town but the castle, which had been modernised by Bishop Courtenay in the 1490s (his arms appear over the main gate, pers. obs.), seems to have been little used by Fox; on which, see Allen and Allen1929, introduction, xiii.

71 Thompson 1960b, 81-94, who noted that in the fireplace spandrels in the keep Fox's initials could then be seen, these have now been eroded away through the exposure of these fireplaces to the elements. VCH Surrey, **2**, 1905, 600, suggests that the letters **RW** were to be seen on the brickwork of Fox's tower, the great brick-built entry tower on the south side of the castle but these are no loner visible. The tower was built by Fox's predecessor, Bishop Waynflete, on which see Thompson 1960.

rolls do not reveal, and we cannot now tell from the surviving fabric of these buildings, is the extent to which Fox renovated interiors and filled his houses with furnishings, hangings and window glass, although we can surmise that Fox is quite likely to have lived in some style as befitted his position, status and self-esteem. We are given some insight into the scale of his possessions through the provisions of his will in which he bequeathed suites of tapestries to several of his friends.[72] He was not however a builder of grand palaces. Jonathan Woolfson opined that Fox seems to have become 'disillusioned with Wolsey's cult of magnificence',[73] a comment that is hard to square with Fox's own interventions at Southwark, in Winchester Cathedral and at St Cross: all liberally sprinkled with his motto and pelican. Even so, Fox appears to have resided at Saint Cross and at Marwell whenever he could after 1514. Both were small scale and unpretentious establishments, rather than at Wolvesey or Bishop's Waltham where the accommodation could certainly have been defined as in the upper reaches of high status, in other words - palatial.[74] It would however probably be mistaken to regard this as evidence for Fox's humility or humbleness, but better to see in it an attempt to escape, when he could, the stresses and pressures of political life.

[72] Fox's will is reproduced in Allen and Allen 1929, Appendix III; the tapestries are mentioned at pp. 170-71.

[73] Woolfson 2003, 9.

[74] This choice of locale is evident from his letters, particularly so in the period 1513 through to 1516.

Bishop Fox expended considerable sums on St Swithun's, his cathedral church. He appears to have embarked on an ambitious programme of works on the east end of the cathedral soon after 1501, continuing a process that had been started by his predecessors, Courtenay (bishop 1486-93) and Langton (bishop 1493-1501).[75] They had rebuilt the east end of the cathedral, adding the Lady Chapel and chapels on either side (fig. 38). It was Fox who, as executor of Langton's will, was responsible for the creation and outfitting of Langton's Chapel, including the provision of a Renaissance-styled frieze.[76] This frieze is discussed in detail below in the next chapter.

Even as Langton's Chapel was being furnished, Fox caused the great east window and wall of the quire to be taken down and rebuilt in a style that marches with work at Bath Abbey and Henry VII's Chapel at Westminster Abbey.[77] Quite possibly the same master-craftsmen were involved: these were the mason William Vertue and the carpenter Humphrey Coke, two men who worked on royal building projects as well as for Fox.[78] With the new great east window built, a wooden vault was installed over the presbytery (fig. 39).[79] Onto this vault was fixed a large group of bosses:[80] these depict the heraldry of the royal family, Fox's own insignia, the badges of the four episcopates he had held, together with symbols of the *Arma*

[75] Despite the extensive literature exploring the architecture of Winchester Cathedral, there is no coherent, contiguous account of the late fifteenth-century and early sixteenth-century development of the cathedral fabric that takes into account the work of bishops Courtenay, Langton and Fox; see Biddle's discussion of Fox's work in Crook 1993, 257-304.

[76] Smith (pers. comm.) argues that as Langton's executor, Fox would have taken responsibility for outfitting Langton's chapel and noted that Langton himself would appear unlikely to have created for himself a chapel when he had expectations of being elevated to the primacy, as indeed he was in 1501, although he died of plague before being installed. Tracy (1993, 242-3) argues that the stallwork in Langton's chapel dates to after 1501 and could be as late as 1510; Biddle (1993, 258-9) by contrast argues for a date closer to 1500 – this is challenged below p. 128-29. Wright 2004, suggests Langton created the chapel himself.

[77] Fox's rebuilding of the east end of the cathedral is briefly discussed by Draper and Morris in Crook 1993, 189.

[78] On both men, Harvey 1984. Humphrey Coke was a master-carpenter who was appointed by Fox as the master of works at Corpus Christi from 1513; on this, see Allen and Allen 1929, 89, n. 2, and mention of Coke in Letter 56, of 25 Feb 1517, from Fox to Claymond.

[79] The clerestory windows were retained from the earlier build although some of the windows were re-glazed by Fox, Angela Smith pers. comm..

[80] On the bosses see Cave 1927; Cave 1935; Smith 1996.

Christi.[81] There is no documentary evidence stating when any of this was undertaken but the heraldic bosses indicate a completion date of before 1509.[82]

Attention seems to have turned next to the presbytery aisles (figs 38, 39 and 40).[83] The Romanesque [84] exterior walls were taken down and rebuilt with a new arcade of windows in the Tudor court style, and stone vaults were installed.[85] These vaults are studded with bosses bearing Fox's episcopal arms, his pelican device and many examples of royal heraldry.[86] Also here can be seen the sunburst device of the Lisle family (fig. 41), the significance of which I shall discuss below.[87] This work was probably completed *c*.1513-15 when work began on Fox's chantry chapel (fig. 42).[88] This chapel is a wonderful essay demonstrating the virtuosity of the English stonemasons craft in handling a design for a perpendicular structure. A series of volutes on the internal walls form the only feature that hint at the Renaissance architecture that a decade earlier had found enthusiastic patrons in France.[89]

While Fox was re-building parts of his cathedral church, presumably with the enthusiastic co-operation of the prior, Thomas Silkstede, he was also involved in major building projects elsewhere. Alongside Fox's London palace of Winchester House in Southwark stood the monastic church of St Mary Ovary; here Fox is

81 Smith 1996, this however omits discussion of the bosses in presbytery aisles.

82 Lindley 1993, 114-18, discusses the dating of the heraldry in the presbytery vault.

83 Lacking a documentary record for Fox's development of the presbytery, and without any archaeological investigations in this part of the cathedral, the chronology of development here remains uncertain. There is no obvious reason to suggest that the aisles cannot have preceded construction of the east window and its towers or the installation of the vault over the presbytery but, in practical terms, it seems more likely that the aisles post-date the east window and presbytery.

84 Were these still Romanesque like the transepts or had they been partially transformed before the sixteenth century? Fox's interventions here have removed all trace of the earlier building styles so the point cannot now be probed one way or the other.

85 Although mentioned by Lindley in Crook 1993, 117, Fox's redevelopment of the presbytery aisles has not thus far been described in print.

86 A plan of the settings of these bosses is given in VCH Hampshire 5, 1912 (and see here my fig. 38), but there is no description of these vaults and their bosses in print.

87 On the Lisles, and their chapel and monument at Thruxton, see Chapter 12. Apart from the Lisle badge all the other badges are either associated with the royal house or with Fox and his various dioceses or represent the *arma Christi*, thus the presence of the Lisle badge is probably very significant and might be seen as representing a financial donation to the work. Additionally, the presence of the badge infers that Lisle was closely associated with Fox in both the political arena as well as in military affairs. The Lisle badge occurs once each time in bays 1N, 3N, 1S, 2S and 3S – there are thirteen badges in each bay.

88 Smith 1988b; and see Lindley in Crook 1993, 115.

89 On these volutes, see below pp. 136-40.

associated with a great rood screen, re-roofing the church and adding the upper stages to the tower —his distinctive pelican device features amongst the former.[90] The rood screen with its frieze of angels strikingly echoes work in Henry VII's chapel at Westminster and in St George's Chapel, Windsor. Fox's opinion, and his sense of both style and fashion, was much sought after in royal building projects, such as in the choice of subjects and style for the glazing programme at King's College, Cambridge,[91] and similarly in the glazing of Fairford church (Gloucestershire).[92] These glazing programmes also involved the glass painter Barnard Flower. He worked from premises in Southwark that were possibly close by Winchester House.[93] Flower may also have been responsible for the great east window overlooking the quire in St Swithun's that Fox had had installed early in his episcopate.[94] Fox was involved in the building of the hospital at the Savoy, London—another major royal project.[95] He also advised Lady Margaret Beaufort on the building of the two colleges at Cambridge with which she is associated, Christ's College and St John's. As an executor of her will, he saw these projects through to completion.[96]

Fox had almost certainly intended to re-model the transepts of St Swithun's (fig. 38). The new arcades in the presbytery aisle walls extend beyond their junctions with the east walls of the transepts, clearly implying an intention here to re-align these walls and install further arcades of windows in the latest style.[97] Preparatory work in the transepts is also hinted at by preparations for the lowering of the transept aisle roofs. Massive timbers installed sometime before *c.*1520 in the transept

90 VCH Surrey, 4, 1912, 155-56.

91 On King's College Chapel, Cambridge, see Harrison 1952 and Wayment, 1982.

92 On the glass at Fairford, see Wayment 1984.

93 VCH Surrey, 4, 1912, 155 noted that the great east window in St Mary Ovary is a modern replacement for a window installed by Fox, if so, it is possible that Flower would also have provided the glass for this window.

94 Smith 1988a, and Angela Smith pers. comm.

95 On the Savoy hospital, Colvin *et al.* 1975, 196-206.

96 Smith 1988a.

97 I am grateful to John Hardacre, curator at Winchester cathedral for his discussion with me of Fox's work in the transepts, and for arranging access to various parts of the cathedral for the purposes of this study. I am also grateful to Professor Michael Hicks and Dr John Hare for their discussions with me of Fox's work in the cathedral while preparing my study of Silkstede's stalls; on which, see Riall 2003.

aisles as temporary roof supports remain in place to this day (fig. 43). What happened to stop this building project?

New directions

The year 1513 marked a turning point in Fox's life. That year Henry VIII went to war in France, taking with him most of the leading members of the aristocracy and many of the bishops and senior clergy, Fox included.[98] Fox was much involved in the preparations for the war, as may be seen from an exchange of letters in May and June 1513, between himself and Thomas Wolsey.[99] Fox spent much of the spring and early summer in and around Southampton and Portsmouth personally supervising the movement of men and stores, no doubt aided by his own estate officials for whom such tasks would have been somewhat commonplace.[100] It is also clear that by this point Wolsey was becoming the leading advisor to the king with Fox quietly bowing out. It was an expedition that Fox may not have expected to return from, and one aspect of his preparations for going to war was to settle the details of his burial place with the prior and chapter of St Swithun's.[101] Work on building his chantry chapel in his cathedral may have begun that year (fig. 43), but given the complexity of the project, it may be that the drawing up of the plans for the work prevented construction work from commencing much before 1514 or 1515.[102]

Fox survived the campaign, although he was injured when a mule kicked him,[103] and following his return from France he began to withdraw from court life though not before he had participated in preparing one last marriage alliance, that of

98 The campaign is described in some detail in Cruickshank 1990, although Fox is not mentioned by name.

99 Gwyn 1990, 13-4; Allen and Allen 1929, 59-74.

100 Fox's involvement is detailed in a number of letters to Henry VIII and Wolsey as calendared in *L & P* Henry VIII, **I**, 1858, 1881, 1885, 1898, 1899, 1912, 1916, 1976 – in which he mentions he is to travel to 'Sayncte Crosse'; and see Letters 38-46.

101 Smith 1988a.

102 *Ibid.* There is no full architectural survey of the chapel, nor any description of, or drawings, of the mouldings.

103 Davies 2004.

Mary Tudor to Louis XII of France,[104] alongside drawing up a renewed peace treaty between the two countries.[105]

Fox's retirement was in part a result of his old age—he was nearing seventy years old and by now deaf[106]—but more probably because he recognised that he was unable to contend with the political power struggles that were very much a part of court life.[107] It was largely through Fox that Thomas Wolsey rose rapidly in the king's service and, following the considerable success of Wolsey's planning for Henry VIII's expedition to France, it was Wolsey who became the king's right-hand man.[108] Archbishop Warham resigned the chancellorship in late 1514, and the following year Fox resigned the Privy Seal, '... pleading passionately...' as Allen and Allen put it '... for permission to put away worldly things.'[109] This did not at all mean that Fox fully withdrew from public life, for example he remained Prelate of the Order of the Garter.[110] He also remained involved in diplomatic initiatives; thus in June and July 1522 he was host to Henry VIII and the Emperor Charles V. They stayed in his houses and hunted in his parks at Farnham, Alresford, Winchester and Bishop's Waltham.[111]

Accompanying this cavalcade of kings and courtiers would have been Sir Henry Marney,[112] who was a member of Henry VIII's council and Captain of the King's Bodyguard. Did he visit St Cross and take note of the horned dolphins and fantastic birds, and run his hands over the dolphin desk-ends? It would be remarkable if he did not as both appear, in terracotta, on his house, and on his tomb in the church that stands close-by, at Layer Marney.

104 Mary Tudor's life is described in Richardson 1970; Perry 1988; and see Loades 2004.

105 Davies 2004.

106 Gwyn 1990, 17, n.3.

107 Davies 2004.

108 Gwyn 1990, 8-20.

109 Allen and Allen 1929, xiii; and see Letter 52, 23 April 1516, Fox to Wolsey, in which Fox expresses his desire to be allowed to attend to his bishopric.

110 As bishop of Winchester, Fox was automatically Prelate of the Order; on this, see Biddle 2000, Appendix I, 513-18.

111 On this visit, see Biddle 2000, 425-32; here also Biddle discusses the possible role of Fox in the repainting of the Round Table in Winchester castle, this subject is not discussed here as there is no case to suggest any usage of the *all'antica* style.

112 Marney was elected KG in April 1510 and created Baron Marney 9 April 1523, he died five weeks later on 24 May. On Marney, see Carley 2004.

Corpus Christi College

It was at this point in Fox's life that he turned his full attention to his episcopal duties and, in particular, to taking a critical interest in the communities of monks and nuns in his diocese. He was unimpressed by what he found, with a poor standard of education being an especial concern.[113] This prompted Fox to found a college, Corpus Christi, at Oxford.[114] This was a long mooted project for which Fox had begun acquiring land in 1511, and, as suggested above, the inspiration for it may well have come from a recognition that he had failed to fulfil, in his own eyes at least, the pastoral duties of a bishop. We might also note that Fox had also been involved in Lady Margaret Beaufort's foundations at Cambridge, and her example may have induced Fox to create a college himself. He had primarily intended this college to serve as a training ground for those intending to enter holy orders, in an attempt to address some of the problems of poor educational standards in the monastic communities across his diocese. In the event, he was persuaded to commit his college to teaching a range of humanist subjects without any qualification as to who the students might be. Fox seems to have been very much the mainspring and driving force behind the creation of Corpus Christi, and certainly it was he who provided the main financial backing for the establishment and construction of the college, as well as the physical goods to equip it and, of course, many books.

The foundation and financing of Corpus Christi appears to have been to the detriment of most of Fox's other building projects, including the remodelling of St Swithun's; even the Bishop of Winchester's deep pocket had its financial limits and this may account for the piece-meal construction of the presbytery screens.[115] The first President of Corpus Christi was John Claymond,[116] the then Master of the Hospital of St Cross and it was St Cross that was chosen as the setting for the

113 Woolfson 2003, 9.

114 Smith 1988a; see also, Newman in Gunn and Lindley, 1991, 106; Ellory et al 1999 on Corpus silver; and Woolfson 1997 and Woolfson 2003 on John Claymond and Fox's aspirations for his college; and see Davies 2004.

115 Lindley 1993, 118, suggested that Fox's concern with Corpus Christi post-1513 prevented him from continuing his redevelopment of the cathedral east end.

116 Woolfson 1997; and Woolfson 2003; and see Woolfson 2004.

inauguration of the college.[117] This interest in spiritual or benefactorial projects can also be seen in Fox's association with the establishment of a fraternity of the Holy Ghost at Basingstoke. This was a project he undertook with Lord Sandys, who commissioned a suite of glass windows, probably with Fox's encouragement and advice on choice of subjects, for both the Holy Ghost Chapel and his own private chapel in his house, The Vyne.[118]

St Cross

The gift of the office of Master of St Cross lay in the hands of the bishops of Winchester. They often took a special interest in both the institution and its mastership, which was frequently held by someone high in the bishop's own administration or whom, not infrequently, was also a royal servant. When Fox became bishop, the Master of St Cross (1492-1505/09)[119] was Robert Sherburne who, as a diplomat working for Henry VII, if mostly in Rome, must have been well known to Fox.[120] Sherburne evidently spent some time at St Cross as he instigated quite extensive building works amongst the precinct buildings; his work is marked with his initials, **R S,** and his motto, *dilexi sapientum*.[121] His pelican device, a pelican *in piety*, does not appear anywhere at St Cross.[122] Nevertheless it was Fox who, in seventeenth century documents, was credited as the restorer of St Cross.[123] The episcopal pipe rolls reveal that quantities of building materials including stone from

117 Smith and Riall 2002, 143-5.

118 VCH *Hampshire* **2,** 1903, 215, & *ibid* **4,** 135-7; Wayment 1982.

119 VCH *Hampshire* **2,** 1903, 197, shows that much of the original archives for St Cross were destroyed in 1696 and there are therefore *lacunae* in the list of the masters and the dates of their masterships. VCH suggests a possibility that Sherburne's mastership ended in *c.*1500 and that Fox held it from then until 1517.

120 On Sherburne [Sherborn, Sherborne], see Harper-Bill 2004. Sherburne's work at St Cross is not noted in this biography. Fox and Sherborne are reputed to have disliked one another, pers. comm. Angela Smith, and see Letter 82, dated 19 July 1524 (?), Fox to Wolsey.

121 Pers. obs. These appear as stone-cut inscriptions on hearth lintels in what are now the Porter's lodgings (with the date 1503), and painted on glass in the windows in a passage leading from the hall to the kitchens. Sherburne's work has not been examined in detail since Humbert (1868) wrote his book on St Cross.

122 This device is to be seen on Sherburne's tomb in the south aisle of Chichester cathedral. The pelican *in piety* shows the pelican surrounded by its young and usually seated on a nest; by contrast the pelican *vulning* usually shows the bird alone and pecking at its breast to release a blood-flow with which to feed its young.

123 BL Harleian MS 1616 f51.

Normandy and roof tile were sold to St Cross from stores held at Wolvesey during Fox's episcopate; these may have been used in part for the construction of an ambulatory linking the suite of lodgings in the main gate-house wing to the north door of the church.[124]

Fox appears to have spent much time at St Cross although he held neither a post there (John Claymond was Master from *c.*1505/09)[125] nor a role, and nor was there sufficient accommodation for an episcopal entourage.[126] This implies that Fox used St Cross as a form of retreat, an escape from the duties of both royal service and his pastoral cares, where he could be cared for in a quasi-monastic community and yet remain close to Winchester. We might additionally speculate that Fox spent time at St Cross in order that he might enjoy the intellectually-challenging company of John Claymond, who seems to have been a personal friend as Fox lavished praise and patronage on him, culminating with his appointment as President of Corpus Christi.[127] However, we do not know the extent of time Claymond spent at St Cross as it appears he spent much of his time at Oxford, first at Magdalene and later at Corpus Christi. St Cross continues to have that quality of remoteness from Winchester, even though it is only a brisk twenty-minute walk from the city centre.[128]

At some point in the 1510s Fox decided to refurbish the fittings of the chancel in the Hospital's chapel, which included the stalls with their *all'antica* frieze. While it is possible that this work was installed in order to create a spectacular setting for the formal inauguration of Corpus Christi, as I noted above, there is no reason why Fox should not have wished to improve the setting within which he evidently prayed and sought religious comfort on a regular basis some years before 1517.

124 Sherburne's initials and motto could be seen on the brick pillar supporting the oriel window at mid-point of the ambulatory until 1939 when the structure was refurbished and this stone removed.

125 On Claymond, see Woolfson 2004; Woolfson thought Claymond was given the mastership in 1505 and presumably resigned it when he was appointed President of Corpus Christi in 1517; see also Allen and Allen notes to Letter 22.

126 The point is hard to fully substantiate as we have do not have a day-by-day itinerary for Fox; his letters, printed in Allen and Allen 1929, include a number written from St Cross.

127 Woolfson noted (2004) that Claymond had previously been president of Magdalene College, he was appointed to the office by Fox in 1507.

128 Fox also used the college at Marwell as a retreat, Allen and Allen 1929, 114, n.3. On Marwell, see VCH *Hampshire* **2**, 1903, 211-212; VCH *Hampshire* **3**, 1908, 332-35; and Jackson 1961, unpubl ms in Winchester Museum Service archive; and Richard Whinney, unpubl survey, Winchester Museum Service archive.

It is in this context, seeing St Cross as a place of spiritual retreat, that the frieze should be placed. Fox made no attempt to rebuild the church in a new architectural idiom; he could have chosen to rebuild it in a Perpendicular fashion, echoing his choice for his chantry chapel, or in a Renaissance style that could have taken forward into a larger building some of the ideas that were later given voice in the presbytery screens in the cathedral.

The installation of the stalls and frieze was almost certainly incidental to the needs of St Cross, but which was dictated by Fox's own desires and whim. We do not know how the brethren of St Cross reacted to the introduction of this Renaissance frieze that must have been a far cry from anything they could possibly have previously experienced. Fox, we may well surmise, would quite probably have taken delight in explaining the meaning of the frieze, taking it panel by panel, figure by figure, placing each in its Christian context and doubtless describing its pagan and Classical origins too. We may notice that some of the frivolity of other Renaissance designs has here been ignored or omitted, a conscious thought for the setting the piece would occupy; so that while putti are nakedly sprawled across this work, their sexuality is not evident – contrast Fox's cherubs with those pert figures that support Wolsey's arms at Hampton Court (fig. 44). This was a frieze that was intended to be a mirror of its time and setting, reflecting Christian values alongside all the pre-occupations of a Christian life.

All'antica in Winchester cathedral

As we have seen, Fox's building campaigns in the cathedral encompassed the reworking of the east end of the cathedral eastwards from the quire and terminating with the junction with the retro-choir, thus his work mainly comprised just the reworking of the presbytery. This work appears to have come to a halt by *c.*1515-17 and is characterised by its usage of the Tudor court style that is largely devoid of any Renaissance features. Sometime around 1520 and culminating by 1525, Fox again intervened in the fabric of the cathedral and commissioned the reconstruction of the presbytery screens that separate the presbytery from its aisles and this last programme of work is discussed in Chapter 12.

Although he was a patron of some Renaissance-styled carving, virtually all of the work Fox commissioned was executed in the Tudor court style; thus fundamentally Gothic. The stylistic divide seems to appear around the year 1515, that is to say following the short war with France. While the building works at Corpus Christi spanned this period (they were perhaps not completed until after 1515) there is no evidence for the application of *all'antica*-styled carving or decorative elements there. Fox's chantry chapel, similarly a building project initiated before the war but completed some years afterwards, has the most minimal of references to the usage of *all'antica*, with the possible use of volutes on what is otherwise an emphatically Gothic structure. There is no trace of any *all'antica* work having been applied to any of Fox's residences.

While mindful of the fate of Thomas Wolsey's Hampton Court, which seems to have had extensive *all'antica* work applied to the external surfaces of the building, virtually all of which was either removed by Henry VIII's orders or was destroyed in the following centuries, we can be less certain that Fox had his residences decorated with *all'antica* ornament. Aside from the terracotta plaque bearing Wolsey's arms that was clearly executed in a Classical idiom, and the terracotta medallions with their portraits of Roman emperors, our knowledge of *all'antica* decoration at Hampton Court emerges solely from archaeological excavations.[129] Archaeological excavations at Bishop's Waltham, Farnham, Southwark, Taunton and Wolvesey have not revealed any trace of *all'antica* work.[130] This does not necessarily mean, as I indicated above, that the interiors of these buildings were not decorated with *all'antica* work in the form of tapestries, plasterwork, fireplaces, wooden furnishings (including panelling and screens) or stained or painted glass. But the fact remains that there is nothing now surviving from Fox's episcopate that points to the use of

[129] On *all'antica* work at Wolsey's Hampton Court, see Thurley 2003, 15-41; and see for an alternative view, Jonathan Foyle, 2003, 'An Archaeological Reconstruction of Thomas Wolsey's Hampton Court Palace' 2003, unpubl. PhD thesis University of Reading.

[130] The extent of archaeological excavations at these sites is discussed in Riall 1994. Esher has not been explored via an archaeological excavation, and much of the building complex there was demolished before the eighteenth century.

all'antica work on these buildings, whereas there are traces of the Tudor court style, as for example at Farnham where fireplaces and windows in this style survive in the keep.

* * *

On this basis, Fox would seem to have had conservative tastes rather than being an eager patron of the avant-garde, for unlike some of his contemporaries such as Brandon, Marney, Weston and Wolsey, Fox did not adopt terracotta as a building material, either plainly moulded or *all'antica*-decorated. And similarly his taste in window glass, while embracing developments in the Netherlandish school which saw the creation of the suites of glass at Fairford and King's College Cambridge, did not extend to using the developed Renaissance style that appeared in the glass at Basingstoke in the Holy Ghost chapel, although Fox was perhaps associated with the creation of the programme of this work. This glass was anyway not installed until the 1520s by which time Fox had lost his sight, a point that should perhaps be borne in mind when considering the fitting-out of the cathedral presbytery in the 1520s. Set against this background of conservative taste, the frieze at St Cross appears to be a startling choice, indeed almost contradictory. Fox certainly never commissioned another piece of its like and the frieze itself was never, insofar as we can be certain, replicated elsewhere either wholly or in part.

Unlike Georges d'Amboise, Richard Fox was not apparently an enthusiastic patron of Renaissance work however applied in any of the arts. D'Amboise was by contrast caught-up in an acceptance of a style that had been experienced first-hand by a wide section of the leading members of French society in Italy itself; whereas Fox, and many of his contemporaries in England, never saw Italy and before 1515 may well have had very little exposure in England (or in France) to the style. This then also influenced the choices Fox made and reveals that the selection of a Renaissance frieze for the suite of stalls at St Cross was itself a ground-breaking

event, marking in England quite possibly the creation of one of the earliest, perhaps even the first, major work to be executed in the new, *all'antica,* style.

Section Two

Early Renaissance in Winchester

Chapter 6:

Richard Fox's Renaissance frieze at St Cross Hospital, Winchester

THIS CHAPTER HAS TWO SECTIONS, the first explores the general background to the frieze, the historiography of the frieze and its setting in the church of the Hospital of St Cross; the second section provides a detailed description of the frieze itself and culminates with a reconstruction of the frieze and the stallwork. The iconography of the motifs is discussed in the next chapter, Chapter 7, while sybils are discussed in Chapter 8 and the parallels with the stallwork at Gaillon are discussed in Chapter 9, where also I shall discuss the problem of dating the St Cross frieze. St Cross itself lies approximately two miles south of the city of Winchester, and is situated beside the water meadows of the River Itchen and has a quality of remoteness even today that must have been even more notable in the medieval and Tudor periods despite the presence of the main road south to Southampton that runs down the west side of St Cross.

The Renaissance frieze was the subject of a survey by Angela Smith and me that culminated in a paper published by the Society of Antiquaries of London.[1] This

1 Smith and Riall 2002.

was based upon a general survey backed by a partial photographic survey of the surviving fabric. This chapter of my dissertation is based upon that survey but draws upon my further work, both at St Cross and elsewhere. Additionally, and for the purposes of this present description and analysis, a new photographic survey was made of the frieze using two digital cameras, first a Fuji Finepix 6900 and later a Canon Eos 300D.[2] An important aspect of this research has been to attempt a restoration (on paper) of the frieze and, from this, to establish some idea of its original shape and the layout of the fittings of the chancel, and to identify the main design themes of the frieze.

1. Introduction

Later in the second decade of the sixteenth century, Bishop Richard Fox caused a new suite of furnishings with an *all'antica* frieze to be installed in the chancel of the church of the Hospital of St Cross, Winchester (the remains of which are shown in figs 1 and 2). As we now know,[3] this setting comprised a set of sixteen canopied stalls and desks constructed in an approximate U-shape (figs 53 and 54) with a two-tiered frieze filled with *all'antica* motifs, including portrait profiles in medallions.

Having survived relatively intact until the mid-nineteenth century, the frieze and furnishings were dismantled and dispersed around the church. Before we can examine the frieze, this process of dismantling and dispersal must be examined in order to establish exactly what was originally present in the chancel in the earlier sixteenth century.

St Cross and St Faith church

There is evidence for an intervention in the fabric of St Cross prior to the creation of the Renaissance frieze and stallwork which, possibly, should also be directly

2 The Fuji has a built-in lens while the Canon is a digital SLR camera to which a range of different lenses can be attached, as well as permitting the use of wireless flash photography.

3 *Ibid.* Prior to this survey no case had been made to link the frieze to the stalls and desks, nor were all these fittings clearly associated with Fox.

associated with Fox, and which in part was a result of the abandonment of the nearby church of St Faith. This parish was adjacent to St Cross but had apparently decayed throughout the fifteenth century, perhaps a lingering result of the Black Death.[4] The parish church of St Faith had been granted to St Cross by Cardinal Beaufort in 1446, then in 1507 Fox obtained a licence to have St Faith demolished, and for the care of the parishioners to be granted to St Cross.[5] It is possible the chancel of St Cross was altered to take account of these changes, with the stone screens taken from St Faith's re-erected in the eastern pair of bays of the chancel (fig. 55) and the western bays infilled with walling capped with crenellated cresting typical of the Tudor court style in order to create a choir more in keeping with a parish church.[6] Francis Baigent discovered wall-paintings on the chancel walls later in the nineteenth century, but these have never been described in a publication.[7] Probably associated with this work are some benches now in the north transept of the church of St Cross which feature Gothic-style poppyheads depicting Fox's arms. These can hardly belong with the Renaissance stallwork, and the poppy head benches should presumably be seen as pre-dating the stalls.[8]

Frieze and furnishings

The frieze was re-installed in the chancel early in the twentieth century where, later, two canopied stalls and two desks were also re-instated (figs 1 and 2). Other desks from the suite continued to be used elsewhere in the church, whilst fragments of the frieze were gathered together into a set of panels, termed here the composite panel,

4 Hopewell, 1995, 67-8. The parochial area of St Faith's lies to the north of St Cross (i.e. between St Cross and the city) with the parish graveyard still in use, this presumably the original churchyard of the demolished church.

5 See Baigent's notes, BL Add. MS 39976 ii f.422^{v}; Bramstow and Leroy 1882, 199; Carpenter-Turner 1957, 28.

6 The screens appear in all historical accounts of St Cross but have never been closely examined and analysed. The screens do not form a pair, nor is it necessarily the case that they came from the same original work. The screen on the south incorporates a tomb chest but it is not known whose tomb it was.

7 HRO 111M94W, H6/5, 6 and 8; and see Abbott 2001.

8 These benches are described below, see p. 184

and this was and remains displayed in the Morning Chapel (fig. 3).[9] The first problem to be resolved is to show that these various pieces (frieze, stalls and desks) do indeed all belong together, as this will serve to help define the purpose in creating the St Cross frieze, demonstrating that it belonged to a larger set of furnishings rather than being an individual section of work.[10]

The necessity of establishing this is sharply focussed when the activities of the mid-nineteenth century architect and restorer of St Cross, William Butterfield, are considered. In a campaign of renovation, reconstruction and questionable beautification carried out in the 1860s, which was aided and enthusiastically supported by the then Master of St Cross, L. M. Humbert (Master 1855-68), the interior of the church was virtually gutted. All the seating arrangements and other furnishings were altered or replaced, along with the laying of new floors and alterations to the stone fabric of the church. In amongst this work, the remnants of Fox's suite of furnishings in the chancel were removed and placed in the Morning Chapel. Butterfield also designed a series of schemes for the painting of the church walls, though in the event only the chancel was actually decorated (figs 56 and 57).[11] This paintwork was removed in 1928. But what of the chancel woodwork? The two sections of frieze that are now in the chancel were returned there, and placed between the western two pillars, probably sometime in the 1890s (fig.. 58).[12] The remainder of the furnishings – the stalls and desks as well as part of the frieze that is

9 The Morning Chapel is the side chapel on the south side of the chancel; it is so called because for many years the brothers of St Cross met here daily for morning prayers.

10 This problem was highlighted early in the Smith and Riall survey when Smith was very doubtful that the frieze formed part of a wider suite of work that included the canopied benches, an observation she based on the colour differential between the benches and frieze. I should emphasise here that virtually all the on-site work carried out for the Smith and Riall survey (i.e. taking the photographs, measurements etc, and exploring the physical structure of the suite) was my responsibility, with Angela Smith undertaking much of the art-historical research.

11 On Butterfield at St Cross, see Abbott 2001. See also Pevsner and Lloyd 1985, 709-11 wherein it can be seen that Butterfield's paint-scheme was admired by Pevsner, even if his work on the fabric was not. Butterfield's scheme of paintwork is well-illustrated in the *ILN* and *Builder* reports, see fig 6.

12 As will become clear below, this re-placement of the frieze can be demonstrated by reference to the engravings which appeared in the 1865 reports published in the *ILN* and *The Builder* – both show that when Butterfield completed his work the frieze was not in the chancel as the inside face of the middle column of the chancel can be seen, when the frieze is in place it is largely obscured.

now on the south wall of the Morning Chapel – led a peripatetic life until the early 1950s when the setting, as it now can be seen, was established.

Modern scholarship has tended to follow in the footsteps of nineteenth century and earlier historians – and we may note at the outset that for all these writers the dominant theme when writing of St Cross was the medieval architecture – but it is to these writers, and the artists and engravers of this period, to whom we must turn in order to clarify the problem of what furnishings belonged with the frieze and how these were arranged in the chancel.

The presence of the Renaissance frieze at St Cross is hardly noted in any survey of churches and their fittings at either a local or a national level to this day.[13] This may in part be due to the important place the church occupies in the development of early Gothic architecture, so much so that an early engraving of the interior of the church strips away fittings and dividing walls to leave only the earlier medieval structure,[14] although, in a surprisingly anachronistic twist, the perpendicular screens are shown left in place (fig. 55 and see fig. 4).[15] Pevsner, in his survey of the buildings of England, *Hampshire*, noted,

> 'In the W bay remains of stalls. They must be Early Renaissance, say of *c.*1525.
>
> Profiles in medallions. Charming and excellently done tiny corbel figurines.'[16]

This terse description does less than justice to the frieze, even if Pevsner seemed to have recognised that stalls and frieze belonged together.

That the frieze, stalls and fittings should have escaped detailed academic attention until Smith and Riall's survey seems puzzling. It is not that Renaissance material in Winchester was being ignored, as can be seen from Biddle's 1993 survey of Renaissance work in Winchester Cathedral, which makes no mention whatever of St Cross despite the obvious connections.[17] Biddle followed in the footsteps of Blunt,

13 We may observe that Simon Jenkins does not mention the frieze in his book, *England's Thousand Best Churches* (1999).

14 Drawn by F Mackenzie and engraved by S Rawle for Britton's *Chronological History of English Architecture*. The print may have been issued separately and is dated 1 Sept 1819. (HRO Top W. 2/140/4).

15 These are of course also Gothic, if much later in date. As noted above, these are the screens that were brought to St Cross from the nearby parish church of St Faith's.

16 Pevsner and Lloyd 1985, 711.

17 Biddle 1993, 257-304. Martin Biddle's omission seems all the more surprising when it is remembered that he was for a time resident in Winchester and the director of a long series of very important archaeological excavations in the city and its suburbs. The connections

who made the first serious connection between artistic developments in France and at Winchester in the early sixteenth century.[18] Blunt seems not to have visited St Cross, as surely he would have been struck by the similarity of the designs on the frieze there and those to be found at Gaillon in Normandy.[19] By contrast, Elizabeth Lewis was well-aware of the Renaissance frieze at St Cross when she wrote her paper on the painted frieze and ceiling from Winchester College.[20] Lewis however offers little more than noting that the frieze was present at St Cross at the time (1547x1555) when the Winchester College frieze was being created.

Eighteenth and nineteenth century historians of St Cross

Thomas Wharton, writing in 1760, noted the '... names of all the officers belonging to the Hospital about AD 1575 are carved on a desk in the chancel, amongst which we find those of a Chanter and singing men...' (fig. 59).[21] This desk survives and stands in front of the canopied stall on the north side of the chancel. Thereafter a series of local histories mention the desk carved with the names of the officers until 1789-90,[22] when we find the first indirect reference to the frieze.

In the late eighteenth century, prompted by an increasing interest in all things antiquarian, the artist-illustrator John Carter was commissioned to produce accurate drawings of ancient sculpture and paintings in England, which in practice mostly meant medieval, thus Gothic, pieces. His finely engraved drawings were printed, together with a text written by knowledgeable local historians or antiquarians (fig. 5). Carter probably visited St Cross in 1788, when he drew the

between Silkstee's frieze and St Cross were only discussed in print for the first time in 2003; on which, see Riall 2003b.

18 Blunt 1969.

19 As Blunt also spent much time in Paris (on whom, see Carter 2001) it seems very likely he would have been aware of the Gaillon stalls in St Denis although, insofar as I have been able to discover, he did not write about them.

20 Lewis 1996, 137-165. Elizabeth Lewis was then the Curator of the Winchester Museums Service, long time resident in Winchester and a frequent contributor to studies in local history. For a review of Lewis's comments on the college frieze, see Riall 2005.

21 Wharton 1760, 18. Wharton mentions also the stone-carved screens in the eastern part of the chancel but otherwise offers little description of the interior of the church – the frieze and stalls are not mentioned.

22 For example Wavell's 1773 history which is almost a word-for-word copy of Wharton's 1760 volume.

corbel figurines of the frieze, various pieces of stone sculpture and drew a fairly detailed sketch plan of the church;[23] he noted on one of his sketch drawings that the figurines were at 'the bottom of the pinicles (sic) to the stalls of the choir'.[24] Carter's drawings were published with a commentary written by the famous Winchester historian, John Milner.[25] In both this text, and in his meticulous survey of the history and antiquities of Winchester, Milner makes little more than a passing, oblique reference to the frieze, although he dates the work to the reign of Henry VII.[26] In contrast, Milner provided a detailed description of the church. Nonetheless, it is Carter's and Milner's observations that provide conclusive evidence that the frieze was present at St Cross in 1790 and tell us something about its general form;[27] of particular importance are the descriptions and drawings of the corbel figurines, together with Carter's numeration, as this has implications for the layout of the frieze. In Milner's text accompanying Carter's drawings is the comment that 'the carved work (of the frieze) with similar figures, within the living memory of the present brethren, continued across the entrance of the choir'.[28] Carter's unpublished plan of the church (figs 53 and 63), although somewhat ambiguous, echoes Milner's comments and suggests that in 1790 the frieze, stalls and associated timberwork was largely intact.[29]

In common with many counties in the later eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, Hampshire attracted the interest of local historians who wrote county or topographical histories. One such appeared in 1805; this included a short description of St Cross from which we learn that there were '...sixteen stalls, over which are

23 Carter did not publish this plan, BL Add MS 29928 f.120; this is discussed further below, see pp. 151-2.

24 BL Add MS 29928 f.127.

25 Carters sketches, drawings and notes are now in the British Library. The material relating to St Cross is catalogued under: BL Add MS 29928 ff. 114 et seq. A selection of Carter's drawings was published in 1790. Carter is usually, and wrongly, credited with the text that accompanies his drawings; the drawings of St Cross were accompanied by a text written by John Milner whose contribution was dated May 20, 1790.

26 Milner's *History and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester,* in 2 vols, was first published in 1790 and went through many re-prints and editions but without adding anything further to his comments on the furnishing of the chancel at St Cross.

27 Amongst Carter's sketches was one (perhaps incomplete) that seems to show the layout of the stallwork as it then existed; BL Add MS 29928 ff. 120, see below pp. 151-2.

28 Milner in Carter 1890, 39.

29 Carter's plan is held as BL Add MS 29928 ff. 120

curious sculptures of the most illustrious personages of Scripture History'; a footnote in this history informs us that these were the figures drawn by Carter and are thus to be interpreted as the corbel figurines rather than the medallioned portraits.[30] It was not until 1818 that a fuller description appeared when Ball wrote,

> 'On each side of the choir is a semicircular range of stalls in wainscot,[31] ornamented with a variety of carving, amongst which a series of medallioned busts form the pendants of the canopies. On the desks of one of the stalls a variety of fanciful letters are cut, purporting to be the initials and names of officers belonging to the choir in 1575...'[32]

This description appeared at the same time as, quite independently, another engraving of the interior of the church appeared, this in a survey of architecture (fig.. 4).[33] This shows a composite section through the chancel illustrating the west bay of the chancel with frieze, canopied stall and desk and, on the left, the east bay with one of the stone screens from St Faith's. The accuracy of the drawing can be judged by comparison with a later watercolour of the interior of the church, this shows the frieze in place on the south side of the chancel (fig. 60). The architectural section is important also for showing the presence of a desk with what appears to be a dolphin terminal on its end panel.

Taken together, the various strands of evidence from written and drawn sources of the late eighteenth and the early nineteenth century point to the existence of a semi-circular range of stalls and desks with an attached frieze that incorporated medallioned portraits and corbel figurines. Thus it would seem that until *c.*1825-50 the stallwork at St Cross remained relatively intact, perhaps decaying and having lost the friezework that spanned the entrance into the chancel but nonetheless with its sixteen stalls recognisably a suite that was then still substantially as Fox had had it created. None of the written or drawn descriptions can really be described as anything other than brief, and this leaves some room for doubt as to the fuller identity of the work and how it may be recognized.

30 Bayley and Britton 1805, 112.

31 For wainscot we can I think safely infer the presence of linenfold panelling which is a characteristic of the desk fronts and can also be seen in the stall exterior end panels.

32 Ball 1818, 229-30. Ball also noted, p. 226, the presence of some 'old wainscot presses carved in scrolls, somewhat similar in design to those of Silkstede, in the south transept of the cathedral...'. These have since disappeared but their presence is very intriguing.

33 Drawn by C F Porden and etched by I Le Keux.

The desk with carved names that so frequently attracted local historians attention still survives as that sited on the north side of the chancel (fig. 59), although it is known to have been moved on at least two occasions. Why should this matter? Given what we know of the disruption inflicted on the fittings of the chancel, it is important to be able to demonstrate very clearly any evidence which links the individual pieces together. The presence of the date and graffiti on the desktop leads us to examine this desk more closely. It appears never to have been altered or re-fitted thus we may with some certainty assume that at the very least it belongs to the late Tudor period. The style of the desk, its shape and construction, along with its components parts and its form of linenfold panelling mean that we can link this one desk to the remainder that are scattered around the church, two in the nave and one (now in two pieces) in the Morning Chapel.

Above the curved woodwork of the canopies of the stalls, but hidden to view from ground level, is the remaining timber of a now truncated construction (fig. 61). This can interpreted as the remains of the supporting structure to which the frieze would have been attached. None of this is immediately apparent. Indeed the texture and colour of the stalls and desks contrast quite strongly with the frieze, so much so that it is only through examining the mouldings that the association can be clearly determined. All of these points will be addressed more fully below. We can therefore proceed to examine the frieze as part of a suite of furnishings for the chancel, rather than simply a frieze alone.

The description by Ball noted above of a semi-circular layout seems at first sight to be improbable, surely a fanciful description rather than an accurate one. This description is however supported by a plan of the interior of the church that appeared in F. T. Dollman's *Ancient Domestic Architecture* of 1858 (fig. 53),[34] which in turn amplifies and makes sense of Carter's plan of the church drawn in 1788.[35] When this plan is compared with three sketches of the interior of the church, two by

[34] I suspect the plan is somewhat earlier than 1858 but have been unable to discover an earlier printed edition. In one of those strange ironies for which there is apparently no logical explanation, the plan of the interior of the church appeared in a book devoted to the study of domestic architecture. Dollman did not describe the architecture or the internal fixtures and fittings of the church.

[35] Carter's plan was never published. The drawing shows the layout of the interior of the church but does not give the thickness of the walls or the fuller detail that is available in Dollman's survey.

Brough (fig. 60)[36] and a third from Mudie's *Hampshire* of 1838 (fig. 62),[37] it becomes clear that the Dollman plan (fig. 53) appears to reflect the layout not only of the stone fabric of the church but also the fixtures and fittings, including the blocks of stalls and seating in the nave and in the chancel. Brough's view of the chancel, also published in 1858, taken from the north-west shows a canopied stall with the frieze above it on the southern side of the chancel, but the picture is insufficiently detailed to unable us to identify from it which sequence of medallions and corbel figurines was placed here (fig. 60). However, this painting contradicts Dollman's plan; the block of stalls is shown completely isolated and, for reasons that will become clear, the canopied stalls shown here have been switched from their original location on the north side of the chancel. Brough's painting therefore demonstrates that sometime before 1858 there were alterations to the arrangement of the stalls in the chancel which included the removal of the lateral range. Further, Dollman's plan can be shown to reflect the organisation of the furnishings at a date sometime before 1858, although how much earlier is difficult to establish and I would suggest 1825 as an optimal date.

The Dollman plan purports to show that the layout of the furnishings in the chancel conformed to a semi-circular or horseshoe-shaped arrangement. While this is not entirely true, the layout of the frieze, as we will see, can only have been a multi-angular structure because all of the components are straight-edged rather than curved as a semi-circular arrangement would require, it provides further evidence that the frieze and stalls belong together and additionally, asks us to look harder at the fine detail of the construction of the frieze and the canopied benches and desks. With these comments in mind we can reflect back to Carter's sketch drawing of 1788 (fig. 63) which, although seemingly incomplete, shows a dislocated group of furnishings that form an angled U-shape.[38] Further, the sweep of Carter's pencil seems to suggest a series of straight sections rather than the continuous curve to be seen in Dollman's survey. Carter also shows a pair of short sections set either side of

36 A set of four water-colours were made by N. W. Brough and engraved as a set for commercial reproduction in 1858. When Brough made his paintings is unclear. HRO Top Winchester 343/2/124.

37 Mudie 1838, opp. p.97.

38 BL Add MS 29928 f. 120. It is unclear whether Dollman's plan drew upon the information given in Carter's drawing of 1788.

the entrance into this work, which might suggest that the frieze extended down the side of the lateral ranges. Given that Carter evidently saw the frieze when it was intact and drew the corbel figurines in sequence,[39] we can be certain that this drawing was simply a provisional sketch which only in the light of Dollman's plan makes sense. Finally, mention must be made of Woodward's description in his *History of Winchester* (1860). Woodward says,

> 'In the place of the old stalls are found sixteen of more recent date, with a most elaborate and well-carved Renaissance canopy above them; the pendants of which are demi-figures with labels etc, females and kings, etc, with other figures in medallions above, and among the ornaments, Bishop Fox's well-known pelican and the arms of the see of Winchester.'[40]

As we have seen, by the time Woodward wrote his work the arrangement of the stallwork had been disrupted and the lateral range apparently removed which suggests Woodward's observations were not entirely up to date when his book was published. However, he does categorically tell us that at its fullest extent the setting provided seating for sixteen persons.

Butterfield at St Cross

It is greatly to our good fortune that historians and artists took an interest in St Cross before 1860, as there was to be much change in the period 1858-65. The disorganised state of the interior of the church had long drawn criticism (this is evident in figures 60 and 62) and this, along with a growing problem due to dampness, led to a protracted campaign of restoration and renovation organised by the then Master of St Cross, Rev. L M Humbert, and undertaken by the architect William Butterfield.[41] All the church furnishings that can be seen in outline on Dollman's plan were removed (fig. 53), some were preserved, but the majority have since vanished without trace, such as the pulpit which features in Brough's painting (fig. 60).

39 I discuss the figurines in some detail below, but I can note here that from Carter's observations it is clear he saw these *in situ*.

40 Woodward 1860, 225. The old stalls that Woodward refers too most likely are the poppyhead benches now in the North transept which I noted earlier, see above p. 144 and see also below p. 184.

41 The criticism of the interior is implicit in Humbert's description of the church, Humbert 1868.

The sparse details in the records of St Cross do not record precisely what was undertaken during the 1860s in the church, so much so that when we consider the fate of the frieze, stalls and desks we can only do so by reference to a series of engravings and photographs. We do not have any day-books or other records that detail the actual process or development of Butterfield's work, nor, perhaps surprisingly, any architect's plans or elevations for what Butterfield proposed to do. We know from Humbert's own description of the church that he and Butterfield considered the old layout in the church to be collegiate in style, and not therefore suited to the needs of parish services (i.e. for the parishioners of St Faith's) and thus in need of modernisation which, in the event, required the removal of all the old furnishings.[42]

That the chancel was entirely stripped of its older fittings can be seen from two engravings of 1865; these appeared alongside reports in the *Illustrated London News* and *The Builder* that described the completion of the restoration work at St Cross (figs 56 and 57).[43] These show that new suites of woodwork were ordered, and the chancel and nave fitted out with new pews and desks, with virtually nothing of the pre-nineteenth century work retained; the screen across the entrance into the Morning Chapel and another that divides the north transept from the crossing were retained, both dating from the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries.[44]

The two engravings show slightly different views looking into the chancel from the nave and show, in the *ILN* engraving (fig. 56) the north side of the chancel while the engraving in *The Builder* shows the south side (fig. 57). For the purposes of this enquiry, these engravings have an additional importance in that they show the frieze was, in 1865, not *in situ* for the stone-work of the columns and, in the case of the north side of the chancel, the partition wall can be seen which, when the frieze in place, is not possible (fig.s 1 and 2). It was at this point, in the mid to later-nineteenth century, that the frieze and the stalls were separated one from the other. What became of the various pieces in the next half-century?

42 *Ibid.*

43 *Illustrated London News*, Nov 18, 1865, 481-86; *The Builder*, Oct 28,1865, 763-65.

44 The screen across the north aisle chapel was erected as a memorial to the fallen of the Great War.

The frieze appears to have been returned to the chancel in the years between 1865 and *c.*1890 when, in the first of a series of guides to Winchester by the local historian William Warren, photographs show the frieze set between the pillars in the chancel but without the canopied benches (fig. 58).[45] The benches and desks were moved to the Morning Chapel, presumably during Butterfield's renovations, where they remained until the early 1900s.[46] An internal view of the Morning Chapel looking west, published in Warren's 1902 guidebook, shows two canopied benches with six desks (fig. 64); of these, the two on either side of the door are complete with dolphins set on top of the end-boards. These were later split up and the dolphins distributed around four desks, a fifth dolphin terminal serves as a shelf bracket on the south wall of the Morning Chapel; the uneven number of the surviving pieces possibly indicating that others have been lost.[47] The linenfold panelling is clearly visible on the desk fronts. Above the door is to be seen the collection of fragmentary pieces of frieze gathered together into the composite set of panels.

By the 1940s, the composite panels had also been moved again, this time to the south wall of the Morning Chapel. An undated photograph, but which can only have been taken after 1912, shows the material here. Also by this date, other photographic evidence shows the canopied stalls and some of the desks had been moved again and these were now positioned in the north transept.[48]

Canopied Benches

Thomas Jackson RA, writing in 1924, thought the canopied benches were made-up pieces that employed odds and ends of panelling all knocked together. Jackson was then architect to the Hospital of St Cross and he wrote in July 1924 to the committee that oversaw the management and finances of the Hospital of St Cross,

45 Warren 1899, *St Cross Hospital*; Warren 1899, *Guide to Winchester*, 185.

46 This is the first precise evidence for the location of the stalls and desks as they are previously either not mentioned or do not appear in any photograph or drawing of the interior of the church.

47 We do not know how many desks there were originally, but there would have been at least four and perhaps as many as six. It is possible each desk had dolphin finials at each end.

48 VCH, 5, 1912, 65

'By the desire of your chairman and Sir William Portal, I have considered the question of replacing the old stalls in the Chancel which were removed by Mr Butterfield. .... the woodwork is in a very poor state. The ends of the stalls are made up of odds and ends of panelling roughly knocked together. Linen[fold] patterns are cut across and framed in anyhow, and the parts are otherwise imperfect.

My son suggests, and I think with some reason, that the stalls do not belong to the church but were brought from elsewhere and roughly knocked together to fit the choir. They may have come from St Faith's Church.'[49]

While it is certainly the case that more than two styles of linenfold are present in the makeup of the canopied benches, there are no clues as to when or why this occurred. It may even have been a deliberate design element in the original conception of these benches.

At any event, sometime after 1924 the canopied stalls and two desks were returned to the chancel. As far as it is possible now to tell, these pieces appear not to have been altered apart from the removal of the dolphin terminals from the desks. This too is in itself important. Butterfield apparently had no interest in making good these pieces of furniture, indeed it may be that he quite despised the style and manner in which they had been made, as is evident from his removal of the entire suite of furnishings from the chancel and its replacement with new fittings.[50] Why was this necessary? A potential explanation lies in the possible need to provide suitable seating for both the officiating priests and also a choir of more than twelve persons who were to occupy seats that accorded with the then fashion.[51] It would therefore seem likely that no substantial changes were made to the stalls or frieze by Butterfield beyond any necessary work to consolidate or strengthen these pieces.

Three other features present in the canopied benches require consideration here: the decorative rebates that frame each linenfold and plain panel, the angled panels at one end of each bench, and the structure of the woodwork above the canopy (figs 65, 66, 66, 67 and 68). These features tell us much about the layout of the entire suite of furnishings.

49 HRO 111M94W E1/11. The reference to St Faith's appears to conflate the tradition associated with the stone-screens, which are thought to have come from St Faith's, with the origin of the Renaissance-styled stallwork.

50 Butterfield adopted the same policy at Winchester College where he tore out Baroque stallwork; see Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 706.

51 Humbert did not outline his plans for the seating arrangements in the chancel so we do not know what his ambitions were beyond to 'normalise' the arrangements in the church so that they fitted with the general tenor of a parish church in the period.

A first important point to make is that when standing directly in front of the work, it is clear that there is a strong sense of linearity, and compatibility of design style, that runs through the desks, stalls and frieze. This is particularly evident from the vertical mouldings dividing the bays of the stalls and those of the desks in front (fig. 65). Examined more closely, the decorative rebates that frame each panel of the stalls echoes the detail to be found in each of the panels in the frieze, detail for detail. This is particularly evident where the vertical and horizontal mouldings meet; here a square, rebated, moulding acts as a 'punctuation' mark as well as serving as a rotation point for the design (fig. 68). This feature can be seen on all three elements of the stallwork: the desks, the canopied stalls and the frieze itself. Secondly, the style of the ribs is such that they have a rebate on three faces and this is also a feature of all three main elements of the stallwork.

The stalls are rectangular in plan and have a long plank providing the bench, with end-boards either end, and with a series of plain panels along the back (fig. 65). Attached vertically to one front edge of the stalls is a further board, together with its mouldings top and bottom, which were roughly cut down vertically at some point after their original construction, this perhaps occurring in the nineteenth century when the suite was dismantled. This board projects away from the stalls at an angle of 110^0-120^0 (fig. 67). The other end of the stall does not show this feature. In both stalls, this angled-board now appears at their eastern end. The implication of this is that at some point there was panelled woodwork that extended away from the stalls at an unusual angle, not the right-angle we might expect of a regular stallwork but something that was following a very different line. The layout of the chapel, and the extreme size of the pillars supporting the arch above each bay of the chancel, means that while it is possible to fit a set of stalls between each pair of pillars it is not possible to construct a contiguous set of stalls unless these were projected a long way forward into the body of the chancel. This clearly would have considerably reduced and constricted the floor-space of the chancel, so much so that another solution for the layout of a set of stall had to be adopted. The surviving presence of the angled panel at one end of the canopied stalls indicates that there was panelling that linked the canopied stall with the lateral (west) range of stalls and that this panelling served to sheath, or cover, the stonework of the pillar, thus giving the impression of a

continuous work. This panelling would perhaps have also served to conceal the supporting posts necessary to carry the frieze round the corner from the canopied stalls through to hang above the stalls and desks of the lateral range.

Further evidence for this layout emerges from a closer look at the work in the frieze. Here the surviving angled timberwork of the stalls is replicated in four of the pilaster posts in the frieze (fig. 69 and 71: posts 1, 8, 15 and 18), which strongly implies that the frieze and the canopied benches both followed the same plan, and that this plan incorporated an unusual return angle. The survival of four posts suggests that the frieze was turned through two angles, rather than just a single right-angle, to bring it round from the east-west alignment, that led it over and above the canopied stalls, to return across the chancel on a north-south alignment (fig. 54). Thus, one end of the stalls and frieze appears to have had a right-angled return while the other has a more obtuse angle. There is evidence for this right-angled return; inspection of the pilaster posts reveals that two of these (posts 1 and 14) have carving on two faces indicating that they must have been visible on two sides, and thus must have marked a right-angled return. Here then the physical evidence for the plan that Dollman drew (fig. 53), although we can now show that in fact Dollman's curved layout is actually incorrect, and the references by early historians to the 'semi-circular' plan of the stallwork is more writer's licence than a factual description. From this we can therefore deduce that the original layout of the stalls would have resembled an angular U-shape, based on a long east-west arm with a shorter connecting section leading to a second short west arm (fig. 54). Allowing then for literary and artistic licence, this conforms to Dollman's and Ball's semi-circular plan.

Inspection of the structure of the timberwork above the canopy reveals the cut-back remnants of the knees that once would have supported the frieze above the canopy, just as Porden and Le Keux depicted it (fig. 4). We may thus conclude that frieze and canopied bench were designed to be fitted together.

Mention has been made of sixteen places in the stalls. This is given some substance by the remaining work for, as may be seen, the canopied stalls are separated by mouldings to give six bays in each and this is reflected in the similar spacing of the frieze above where six bays mirror the bays below. This spatial

arrangement is further reflected in the desks where pairs of linenfold panels march with each bay of the stalls and frieze. This would leave four seats to be set in the lateral range, two either side of the entry into the chancel.

An unexpected outcome of this survey was the realisation that the sections of frieze and the benches had been replaced in the wrong positions in the chancel. The angled posts in the frieze and benches occur, today, on the east ends of these pieces which, if projected, would result in these pieces stretching out across the eastern part of the chancel (while the posts with two carved faces now appear at the west ends of the frieze). Clearly this is incorrect and the canopied stall and frieze on the north side of the chancel should be on the south and *vice versa* (fig. 54). This would then make better sense of Carter's drawings of the corbel figurines. He would logically be expected to have drawn *and numbered* these figurines sequentially from left to right. In its present layout this is not the case but if the two sections of the frieze are swapped, then Carter's numerical sequence of drawn figurines can be followed more or less exactly, a point reinforced by Carter's own original notes which include references to corbels 7-9 being on the north side,[52] and 16-18 being on the south.[53]

A further realisation from this is that not only are all the corbel figurines that Carter drew still at St Cross, so also are many of the major components of the frieze and other furnishings. Thus, while some of the frieze detail has been lost, including some of the medallions, we do have the majority of the framework; perhaps the only other significant losses are some of the horizontal bars and pilasters from the frieze and the sections of panelling that linked the canopied stalls to the stalls that were placed along the lateral range. This, combined with disentangling the jig-saw puzzle posed by the composite panels, has implications for restoring the shape and overall design of the frieze and its associated stallwork and this is dealt with later in the chapter.

The problem of when and why the benches and frieze were switched around the chancel while not greatly important is nonetheless intriguing. It would seem likely that sometime earlier in the nineteenth century the frieze and its associated fixtures were partially dismantled, some time before Butterfield's restoration began,

52 BL Add MS 29928 ff. 128.
53 BL Add MS 29928 ff. 130.

which thus perhaps explains the confusion as to the correct placement of these fittings thereafter.[54] So what happened? At some point before 1850 the lateral range was removed along with the sections of frieze that stood above it. In order to make the remaining benches look aesthetically pleasing when viewed from the nave it would seem logical to swap the two sets of benches and frieze around. Was this when the angled end-boards of the stalls were cut down? This would make sense of Brough's painting which shows a return frame (fig. 60), which appears to be set at approximately right-angles, on the end facing the nave. The carved work on two adjoining pilaster faces, as now can be seen on the west end posts (post numbers 1 and 14, see figs 69, 70 and 72), clearly alludes to this return frame that was obviously originally visible *from the end*. As placed today it is very difficult to see this detail, almost impossible on the north side and very indistinct on the south because the posts are set very close to the adjacent pillars, and this implies that the corner of the stallwork must have originally stood slightly forward of the pillars.

Historical and artistic sources, when examined together, show that the collection of frieze, canopied stalls and desks are indeed the remains of a suite of furnishings that was designed to house the sixteen men who made up the numbers of the Brothers of the Hospital with their three officers of Master, Chaplain and Steward. The polygonal design of this suite is unusual but might reflect the problems of attempting to accommodate such a suite in the confines of a quite small chancel which possesses very large pillars (fig. 54). The whole suite was probably divided from the nave by a screen, removed prior to 1858, which may very well be that which now separates the north transept from the nave.[55] We may therefore move on with some confidence that this was a full suite of furnishings that was designed to function in an ecclesiastical setting and which was created, as we shall see, in the early Tudor period through the patronage of Richard Fox.

[54] Butterfield would most likely have had the stalls numbered when they were moved though no numers or other marks are visible now. We might contemplate the possibility that the composite panel was created at the same time; i.e. pre-Butterfield.

[55] This would not have been a rood-screen in the sense of such a screen in a parish church as the chapel at St Cross was a hospital chapel, not a parish church.

2: Description of the frieze and catalogue of pieces.

Today, the frieze at St Cross consists of two sections of pierced or open-work that are now set between the pillars of the west bay of the chancel, with a third section in the Morning Chapel (figs 69, 70 and 71). The two chancel sections are just over four metres in length and about one metre in height, whilst the section in the Morning Chapel runs to just over two metres in length.

Basic design

Each of the Chancel sections is composed of six complete bays, in two tiers, created from a framework of posts and rails, with the remnants of a seventh bay on one end, in both cases this being the (currently) east end. All the facing surfaces of this framework are covered in decoration. The vertical posts, or pilasters, are carved with a series of motifs so that no single pilaster is precisely similar to another, while the horizontal rail is covered with a thin board carved with a band of water-leaf pattern with, underneath, an egg and ball pattern. The pilasters are carved on only one face except for the end posts, posts 1 and 14 (figs 69 and 70), which are carved on two adjoining faces. Suspended from the bottom of the pilasters are eighteen corbel figurines, fourteen in the chancel and four in the Morning Chapel. These feature the carved figures of nine men and nine women, most of whom have scrolls and many having additional items which include Instruments of the Passion. These are discussed in detail below and it is sufficient to note here that these figurines probably represent Old Testament prophets and sibyls. At the top of each of the pilasters are a series of capitals, each is slightly different from the next.

Surmounting each of the capitals are two pieces of timber (see e.g. fig. 70 and detail in fig. 71), all of which have moulded detail, on top of which is a second dado covered in egg and ball decoration. Closer examination of these pieces reveals that the carpentry work and construction employed in these pieces is quite inferior to that used for making the remainder of the framework where virtually all the joints and fixings are hidden. These last pieces were almost certainly added long after the Tudor period; it may well be that they were put in place when the frieze was erected

between the pillars of the chancel, in order to give it some rigidity, late in the Victorian period.[56] This feature does not occur in the Morning Chapel (fig. 71).

The frieze is constructed in oak and was originally quite likely to have been gilded; traces of this can be seen in various places on the frieze. By the nineteenth century it would appear that the whole suite of furnishings had been covered in paint, although the full extent of this is unknown.[57] Traces of polychrome can be seen on the corbel figurines, which according to a Brother of St Cross writing early in the nineteenth century, had 'within living memory' written inscriptions on their scrolls. These inscriptions would have identified the figurines. Into this framework were fitted a series of carved panels.

The openwork panels were formed from planks butted together and glued. There does not appear to be any evidence to suggest they were also pegged.[58] The planks range in width from 65mm to 135mm and are from 12mm to 18mm thick. Further pieces of timber were glued to the front of these planks, where necessary, to provide a greater depth of material for carving – for example in the south section the putti faces, now lost, were carved on such pieces. The panels were fitted into the framework by means of vertical slots, or grooves, cut into the inside faces of the pilaster posts and the horizontal surfaces of the central spar (figs 73 and 74). It is possible that small blocks of wood were attached to the back of the frieze, across joints and behind fine detail, at the time of its making in order to provide strength and rigidity but the inconsistency with which these are attached, and the variation in the size and shape of the blocks of wood used, suggests these are Victorian or later additions (figs 75 and 76).[59]

[56] As the top rail appears to be the same as the mid-point horizontal rail, and I should emphasise maybe as it is difficult to absolutely certain that it is identical and therefore of Tudor date, it is possible that the added sections of work on the pilasters were incorporated in order to give sufficient height to the pilasters to carry the top rail over the top of the finials that cap the medallions. This assumes that in its original configuration the frieze had only one horizontal rail.

[57] The back of the frieze reveals that a thick, dark brown varnish was painted onto the rear of the frieze but when this was laid on cannot now be determined.

[58] Short of taking the frieze apart, this is difficult to establish. That said, the edges of planks can be seen in fragments in the composite sections and none of these display any evidence for pegging.

[59] These blocks seem to have only been attached to the frames in the upper tier, where it is possible to see there are none on the lower tier. Also, not all of the upper tier frames have

The panels of the frieze fall into two groups: the upper tier and the lower tier. The basic format for the design of each of the upper tier panels comprises an ogee arch that is sprung from the corner of each panel and this is framed by a moulding, along the inside face, of a similar profile to that used for the ogee arches. This has an external feather-edge that permits the panel to be slotted into grooves cut in the vertical, inside faces of the pilaster posts (figs 73 and 74). In some cases this feather-edge has been removed, see panels N3u, N4u and N6u (figs 79, 80 and 82). Quite why these panels were cut-down or shortened remains a problem. It is unlikely to have occurred after the Tudor period. It only occurs in the (present) north frieze and, as such, might perhaps indicate a design change or reflect that a mistake had been made in the initial measurements taken before designing the layout of the frieze. Each ogee arch is topped by a crocketed finial, with underneath, a suspended medallion most of which feature a head in profile (see e.g. fig 81), and all of which are surrounded and festooned by a medley of fantastic creatures, *putti* and scrollwork. All of this detail is arranged in a series of strong designs that are based on a symmetrical arrangement either side of the central motif: medallion or shield or urn or putto depending on which panel is considered. The top of each panel is unframed, allowing the effusive decoration of each panel to 'escape', as it were, uncontrolled into the wider space of the building within which this frieze was erected.

The lower tier panels have a central motif – putti on the north section and urns on the south and lateral ranges – with supporters, mostly masks on the north side, dolphins on the south and fantastic birds on the lateral range (figs 89-100).[60] These panels have also the same external feather-edge that allowed these panels to be slid into place between each pilaster (fig. 73). The accuracy of the symmetry of the St Cross frieze is one of its distinguishing features and one that marks it out from pieces created in a similar style, such as the Silkstede stalls in Winchester

these blocks. This inconsistency seems surprising in view of the high quality of the carpentry work on display here.

[60] The third, western, side probably had just the one design of central urn with supporting birds and cornucopias and winged putto heads – four frames of which survive in the Morning Chapel.

Cathedral,[61] where the craftsmen seem to have been unable to match the fine workmanship of the those who created the St Cross frieze. This sense of design harmony is carried over into the overall 'feel' of each of the two surviving sections where it can be clearly seen that medallions supported by fantastic creatures predominate in the upper tier on the north, whilst there are putti and dolphins on the south. This is further emphasised by the lower tier: putti and masks on the north frieze, with urns and dolphins on the south. This has implications for assessing what shape the remainder of the frieze took, because the lower tier panels in the Morning Chapel offer a third basic design for the lower tiers suggesting a possibility that the missing 'side' also conformed to an overall general pattern and style. This is discussed below.

Finials

The finials in place today on the north section cannot possibly have been intended to top the ogee arches; quite apart from the disparity in the colour of the wood, the contours and thickness of the ogee arch do not at all match those of the finials we see here: see for example, N5u and N6u. The original form of the finials appears to have been a floriated, crocketed finial, remains of which can be seen in N3u, although this medallion never did belong here in the original scheme,[62] and S4u, with a further example in the Morning Chapel, MC3u. All the south frieze finials appear to be *in situ.* The leafy decoration of these finials is perhaps a reflection of some of the designs of the motifs carved on the pilasters, a group of three leaves gathered together, and further evidence of the close design relationship between the various elements of the frieze even if this leafy element evinces a continuation of Gothic stylistic traits, rather than the introduction of Renaissance work – but is anyway a trait of early Renaissance work in both France and England.

It is possible that some of the crocketed finials seen today once were placed on top of the pilasters. The Brough watercolour of the frieze (fig. 60) appears to suggest that pilaster posts terminated in pinnacles that stood higher than the finials

61 Silkstede's frieze is described below, see Chapter 10.

62 This medallion belonged in frame R1, see fig 114 and see fig 54.

on top of the ogee arches, a view that echoes Carter's note on the corbels when he, perhaps rather ambiguously, wrote of the corbels being attached to the pinnacles.[63] Nonetheless, this seems likely to have been an alteration to the original scheme as it seems somehow inconceivable that such pinnacles could comfortably fit onto the top of the pilasters in a way that compliments the overall scheme and or in a way that could have been aesthetically pleasing.

North side upper panels[64]

Most of these panels have been mutilated and damaged in some measure to the extent that none are complete, while one (N1u) is represented by less than a third of its original carving. The panels can be grouped into three sets of pairs: N1u and N3u, N2u and N5u, and, N4u and N6u on the basis of the types of supporters used for each medallion. A consistent feature of all the north panels is a flower head set at the break of curve in the sides of the ogee arch.

N1u *h* 350mm by *w* 550mm (fig. 77)

Fragmentary remains (400mm high and 190mm wide) featuring a fantastic bird scrollwork and foliate decoration. The same form of bird occurs in N3u and MC fragment 17. The piece shown here has been incorrectly repositioned and should be rotated to the right and fitted against the left-hand post of the frame.

N2u *h* 330mm by *w* 543mm (fig. 78)

Replaced finial over an ogee arch from which is suspended a medallion supported by a pair of affronted birds and a leaf-like form from which emerges mutilated, slashed scrollwork. The birds have horn-like ears that are in the same idiom as the dolphins with similar horns or horn-like ears to be seen elsewhere in the frieze.[65]

63 The top of the posts in the Morning Chapel are devoid of any trace of joint which might suggest a piece was attached to the top of individual posts but this need not preclude the possibility.

64 I have labelled the frieze following an alpha-numeric scheme that gives N1u-N7u and S1u-S7u as the upper (u) tier frames, and N1b-S7b as the lower (b) frames, with MC1-MC4 as those in the Morning Chapel. When prefixed StX, this indicates St Cross.

65 This form of fantastic bird also has a particularly long and flowing set of tail feathers which might perhaps point to this being a peacock. The peacock was seen as an iconographic symbol of the Resurrection.

Fragments of arabesque work joined to the upper part of the arch are the remnants of a design that included a dolphin emerging from scrollwork – compare this panel with N6u. The medallion (*diam* 198mm) features a pelican *vulning* with a leaping dolphin; this motif is discussed further in connection with that in S6u.

N3u *h* 323mm by *w* 540mm (fig. 79)

Two sides of this bay survive with a central section which was intruded in the post-Tudor period. The medallion (*diam* 160mm) now in N3u belongs with pieces of the frieze now in the Morning Chapel and is described below under R1. The two sides of the panel feature slashed scrollwork terminating in affronted dolphin heads with wide-open mouths and complete with characteristic 'plume' which is further decorated with floral motifs. A pair of affronted birds with wings upraised perch on the upper edge of the ogee arch. Both external edges of this panel have been roughly cut back.

N4u *h* 325mm by *w* 568mm (fig. 80)

The medallion here is suspended from the ogee arch by a label supported by foliate scrollwork that merges outwards into further slashed scrollwork from which emerges a beaked bird's head.[66] Above the arch the grotesque head of an embowed, open-mouthed dolphin emerges from (heavily damaged) slashed foliate scrollwork. The presence of bird claws on the dolphin's back indicates that the dolphin was originally surmounted by a bird-like form. The medallion (*diam* 198mm) features a woman facing left in military-like attire, her hair in a cap with a beaded billament. The right hand edge of this panel has been crudely cut back. [The piece of timber visible on the left hand side of the frame is a later addition].

N5u *h* 330mm by *w* 540mm (fig. 81)

Replacement finial. A pair of affronted fantastic birds with horns support a medallion suspended from the arch by two ribbons. A leafy form emerges from beneath the medallion and this is extended outwards into slashed scrollwork. Most of the upper detail is missing but would have included a different form of dolphin than previously seen, to judge from the treatment of the dolphin's beak and mouth, supported by foliate and slashed scrollwork. Like frame N2u, this frame has its

[66] This creature seems to be more birdlike because of its beak but the body-form in fact suggests a dolphin-like creature would be a better identification.

edges intact. The medallion (*diam* 200mm) shows the head of a bearded warrior wearing a cloak and sallet with upraised visor.

N6u *h* 345mm by *w* 535mm (fig. 82)

Only about two-thirds of this panel have survived and, additionally, the left-hand edge has been trimmed back. The arch frames a medallion (*diam* 198mm) which features the profile head of a bearded male facing left with scrolled shoulder piece and wearing a winged sallet. The medallion rests on foliate forms which are extended outwards into slashed scrollwork from which emerges a beaked, bird-like form lying on its back. Above this is a crocketed flower. Above the arch is a dolphin emerging from slashed scrollwork on top of which stood a (now lost) bird. Further scrollwork completes the design of this panel. The original finial has been removed, the fleur-de-lys finial here a replacement. [The piece of timber visible behind and to the right of the medallion is a later addition].

South side upper panels

Like the north frieze, the south comprises six panels representing three distinct forms: S1 and S4, then S2, S3 and S5, and finally the lone S6, with these distinguished on the basis of the component motifs present.

S1u *h* 340mm by *w* 530mm (fig. 83)

Complete panel with re-attached finial which could potentially be original. A wreathed medallion (*diam* 160mm) is suspended from the arch and supported by affronted, open-mouthed dolphins that emerge from slashed scrollwork. Addorsed grotesque creatures,[67] possibly dogs as these have paws and tails, are surmounted by winged putti with further scrollwork. The head of the left putto is missing, that on the right features an 'old' face. The medallion portrays a woman facing right wearing a cap with a scrolled and slashed headband and a dress with a square neckline.

[67] Dogs infrequently appear in Christian iconographic schemes and this rare occurrence here is more likely to be a reference to Fox's long-time loyalty to, and friendship with, Henry VII amongst whose heraldic badges was the greyhound.

S2u *h* 340mm by *w* 530mm (fig. 84)

The finial here has replaced the original. The medallion (*diam* 200mm) hangs by a ribbon from the arch and shows a male head facing right. The ribbon in his hair suggests this might represent a Roman poet,[68] a point that will be considered below in connection with the question of identifying the subjects portrayed in the medallions. The medallion in S2u is supported by winged putti, both have lost their faces, and, above the arch, two further putti are perched on unadorned dolphins and having in their hands ribbons that are fixed around the necks of round-beaked birds.

S3u *h* 340mm by *w* 540mm (fig. 85)

This bay is similar in design to S2u and S5u. The finial is again a replacement of the original. The medallion (*diam* 205mm) bears the profile of a woman facing left. She is wearing a square-necked dress and a cap similar to that in S1, and has ribbons, or some form of face-guard?, which projects around her chin. The lower putti have no faces, while the upper putti feature 'old' faces.

S4u *h* 355mm by *w* 550mm (fig. 86)

The remains of a foliate finial survive on top of the ogee arch but the top of the finial is a replacement. This panel is similar to S1u in its overall design. The medallion (*diam* 180mm) is carved with a male head in profile facing left. Possibly a warrior, he wears a cloak or toga and on his head a helmet with peak and visor.

S5u *h* 340mm by *w* 520mm (fig. 87)

The design for this panel is close to that employed in S2u and S3u. The medallion (*diam* 205mm) hangs by a ribbon and is carved with the head of a helmeted warrior facing left. The faces of the lower putti are again missing while those on the upper level are intact and show 'old' faces. Remains of the original finial are still present but the arch is still surmounted by a replacement.

S6u *h* 320mm by *w* 525mm (fig. 88)

The arch surrounds a medallion that hangs by three ribbons from the arch, the same ribbons used to tie the wreath that surrounds the medallion which is also supported by two winged putti one of which has a 'young' face. The medallion (*diam* 200mm) shows a pelican vulning with partially surrounding foliage – this being Fox's personal device and is taken, with his arms now in the Morning Chapel section, as

[68] See below, p. 170

evidence that Fox was the patron of this frieze.[69] Of the putti above the arch, the right hand putto is now headless while that on the left has an 'old' face, hold ribbons that are twined around the necks of long-necked birds that are vulning – this the only difference in design detail from panels S2u, S3u and S5u.

The medallions

The most significant motif in each of the upper bays is a medallion carved in low relief. Whilst the medallions in the south section of the frieze appear to be *in situ*, with all their supporting open-work, the north section has been considerably disrupted. The edges of the open-work in N3u, N4u and N6u have all been trimmed back into the detail of the open-work and, in the case of N3u (figs 79, 80 and 82), the original medallion has been lost and another substituted in its place. The medallion currently shown in N3u belongs with fragments in the Morning Chapel ensemble, and would have formed a panel of a quite different design, here designated R1 (fig. 114). Frame N1u has no medallion (fig. 77). The medallions are mostly *c.*200mm in diameter; they are suspended by a variety of means from the ogee arch of each panel, and feature nine heads in profile (including the misplaced N3u), five male and four female, and two with pelicans *vulning*.[70] N2u (as does S6u, see figs 78 and 88) has a pelican with a dolphin, which may be taken as a Christian symbol for eternal life; it may also reflect the use of the classically inspired motifs that predominate in the overall design of the frieze but in this context almost certainly must be taken as a reference to Bishop Fox. Each of the medallions is framed by a wreath, which in each example is carved in a slightly different manner. The medallion in N3u has a plain rim apart from slashed decoration radiating around the rim, other fragments of this style of medallion can be seen in the Morning Chapel,

[69] While tempting to leave the unchallenged the attribution of these long-necked birds as pelicans I should note that these may in fact be cranes – a point that is given some substance when we note that the birds are shown poised on one leg standing on a ball-terminal which can be interpreted as a stone. This is characteristic of the iconographical representation of the crane, a symbol of vigilance. There is further a case to reflect that some might also be peacocks; the problem is discussed in Chapter 7.

[70] The term *vulning* is used to describe the pelican that pecks at its breast in order to make itself bleed and thus feed its young and to differentiate this motif from the pelican *in piety* where the pelican is shown in a nest with its young nestling beside it.

frames R1, R2 and R12 (see fig. 114). This form of medallion was plainer and smaller, at *c.*168mm, than the remainder and may reflect something of their use in the angled parts of the frieze away from the canopied benches.

Three of the male heads, two of which are bearded, wear antique-style helmets and one of these, N6u, has winged headgear of a type associated with the Roman god Mercury (fig. 82). S2u features a male head garlanded in a classical fashion with a ribbon (fig. 84). Amongst the female figures, N4u has a denticulated neckline suggestive of classical armour; she wears a cap with a beaded billament (fig. 80). The remaining females are clothed in square-necked gowns typical of early sixteenth century dress, and caps with scrolled ornament. Their style and dress echoing that of the sibyls amongst the corbel figurines.

The St Cross medallions have traditionally been identified as kings and queens; an especially strong local tradition asserted that one of the female figures represented Anne Boleyn and that the frieze was brought to St Cross just prior to a visit to Wolvesey, the bishop of Winchester's palace just to the east of the cathedral, by Henry VIII in the 1530s who by then had had Anne executed.[71] As Fox himself had died before Henry VIII's dalliance and marriage to Anne, this interpretation can be discarded. It is more likely that the medallions were intended as a counter-point to the corbel figurines of sybils and prophets, thus the medallions could be seen as representing series of 'worthies' or virtuous figures. These series were often in groups of nine men and nine women; usually these were organised as groups of three pagans, three Jews and three Christians. There are quite a number of these series but the following example of an assembly of heroes or worthies provides some insight into the range and possibilities.[72]

71 Hopewell 1995, following Humbert 1868.

72 Based on a suite of Nine Worthies engravings made by Hans Burgkmayr in 1516, source, www.nineworthies.htm

Hector	Lucretia
Alexander the Great	Veturia
Caesar	Viginia
David	Esther
Joshua	Judith
Judas Macchabeus	Jahel
Charlemagne	St Helena
Arthur	St Brigita of Sweden
Godfrey of Bouillon	St Elisabeth of Hungary

Table 2: St Cross. Male and female hero or 'worthy' figures.

The presence in the stained glass of Rouen Cathedral of male profile heads wearing classical helmets and with labels associating them with signs of the zodiac indicates a further possibility that the medallions could be associated with an interest in astrology. Additionally, the use of sybils in the frieze and the presence of a winged helmet on one of the profiled figures could be taken to indicate that the frieze medallions relate to the story of Aeneas, with the beribboned figure in S2u perhaps representing Virgil. Thomas Wolsey had a set of tapestries that told the story of Aeneas at Hampton Court[73] and these feature medallions remarkably similar to those in the St Cross frieze,[74] whereas his medallions of Roman Emperors at Hampton Court, made by the Italian artist Maiano, proffer different realisations of Renaissance-style imagery. Henry VII had a series of sculptures in his palace at Richmond that included worthy figures amongst whom were Brutus and Arthur, this a setting that was deliberately propagandist and designed to promote the connections between the Tudors and the kings of ancient Britain, that spoke about the lineage of the Tudors and the legitimacy of their claim to the crown. Arthurian symbolism figured strongly in the ceremonies and pageants that surrounded the wedding of Prince Arthur and Catherine of Aragon, with which Fox, then Bishop of

73 Hampton Court guidebook and per. obs.

74 Pers. obs.

Durham, was intimately involved.[75] As with the corbel figurines, the absence of any identifying clauses and the lack of any attributes, quite apart from the incompleteness of the series at St Cross, render hazardous any attempt to positively identify the medallions.[76]

In our original survey, Angela Smith and I suggested that the medallion in S2u represented Pliny.[77] Jonathan Woolfson thought so too, and connected the image of Pliny to John Claymond's particular and noted interest in the work of Pliny.[78] Although, as Woolfson points out,[79] while Pliny was an 'important source for information about the late Roman practice of adorning libraries and other rooms with the busts of famous writers', this ignores the fact that there is no reference to Claymond in the frieze to whom Woolfson and Smith both credit Pliny's appearance here.[80] A further difficulty is that Fox, with Claymond's support, made great play of working comparisons with a bee hive and the activities of bees into his statutes for Corpus Christi.[81] There is not a single allusion to bees or bee hives in the frieze. This apparent omission should perhaps intimate that attempting to connect the frieze to Fox's ambitions for Corpus Christi is an interpretation too far. Additionally, none of the medallions featured here are obviously to be associated with classical writers, although identification as heroes of antiquity is a possibility. Given the absence of at least two medallions from the series (N1 and N3) the problem is not likely to be

75 On the wedding and its ceremonial, see Kipling 1990. It is intriguing to note that Katherine and her entourage spent some time at Dogmersfield (Hampshire), an estate that belonged to the bishops of Bath, an episcopal appointment that Fox had held briefly, 1492-4.

76 I am indebted to Graham Pollard for his comments on the medallions and his generous correspondence with me concerning this topic. He was unable to identify any of the medallions at St Cross with portraits he had seen on Renaissance medals.

77 In point of fact this was an identification insisted upon by Smith and one I was reluctant to accept.

78 See Woolfson 2003, 17 for this attribution and see Woolfson 1997 for his paper on Claymond and Pliny.

79 Woolfson 2003, 17, n.37.

80 While it is true that Claymond was Master of St Cross throughout the relevant period it is abundantly clear that he was heavily committed to working for Fox in Oxford, first as President at Magdalen and then the first President at Corpus Christi which project Claymond may well have overseen from its early building works through to completion. It also seems from Fox's letters to him that Claymond was mostly to be found at Oxford. This is very suggestive that from perhaps 1515, but possibly earlier, Claymond was rarely to be found at St Cross and was unlikely to have been involved in any work such as patronising new stallwork at St Cross. See Wolfson 2004 for a short biography.

81 Woolfson 2003.

easily resolved. My own view is that Virgil's *Aeneid* offers as good a solution as any, but, as with any other possible solution, the proof is largely lacking. It has also been pointed out to me that it is quite possible that despite the ribbons in his hair, rather than the traditional laurel wreath, this could be a portrait of a Roman emperor, such as Augustus, or that of Julius Caesar who was one of the acknowledged Worthies.[82]

The lower tiers

The lower tiers of the St Cross frieze provide a further series of decorative panels. Two almost full sequences survive, the north and south chancel series, with evidence for a further series amongst the Morning Chapel material. Much of the figurative work amongst these panels reflects the work present in the upper tier series. Further, there is a strong sense of carry-over from the designs of the panels set beneath the tip-seats of Gaillon stalls amongst the lower tier St Cross panels.

North side bottom (figs 77-82)

With the exception of N1b, where most of the panel has been lost, and N4b where a different design was employed, the design for the panels in the north side lower tier is the basically the same with one variation, in N6b. A centrally placed demi-putto emerging from fronds sits on scrollwork and has his hands resting on the backs of horned, addorsed birds (these are the same as those above in N2u and N5u) which peck at the noses of profile masks which hang from scrollwork that is extended out of cornucopiae. In N6b the fantastic birds are absent and the putto pinches the noses of the masks. There are variations in the treatment of the putti: each face is somewhat different, there are differences of detail in the hairstyle, and in the treatment of their bodies. As the treatment of other features is generally very consistent, the variations in the treatment of these putti must have been deliberate.

Panel N4b has, like several of the panels in the upper tier of the north side, had its sides roughly cut back.

82 I am indebted to Dr David Gill in the Department of Classics at Swansea University, and Graham Pollard, for their comments on this medallion.

Panel N5b provides an entirely different scheme. Here a round, moon-like face is framed between scrolled foliage with further flowers and floral motifs either side of the panel. In late medieval symbolism the moon represented the passing of time. The flower head on the left of the panel may be a pomegranate – this many seeded fruit commonly was used to symbolise fertility but it also symbolised the Resurrection. Additionally, the pomegranate was one of the heraldic devices associated with Katherine of Aragon whose marriage to Henry VIII Bishop Fox had strongly advocated. Thus it is possible that the missing element from the right hand side of the panel may have been a rose.[83]

South side bottom (figs 83-88)

The lower panels on the south side feature two basic designs that take an urn as a central motif supported by horned dolphins. In the first design, panels S1b, S3b and S5b have tall lobed urns, from which emerge foliate motifs (these probably represent flames), supported by slashed scrollwork terminating in addorsed horned dolphins with further foliate motifs. The second design, S2b, S4b and S6b, provides for a squatter lobed urn supported by a less complex arrangement of scrollwork and affronted horned dolphins. In S6b the urn is tall rather than squat.[84]

The Morning Chapel [85]

The remnant of the frieze in the Morning Chapel consists of seven panels, four upper tier and three lower together with four pilasters and corbel figurines. The four upper panel are filled with a collection of 28 fragments most of which derive from now lost upper tier panels (fig. 71). The lower tier in the Morning Chapel holds what at first sight appear to be three panels but close inspection suggests the central

83 The pomegranate and rose, both individually and dimidiated, occur in various locations in Winchester Cathedral amongst Fox's work there, especially so on the presbytery screen south frieze, and also on Prior Silkstede's screen in the Cathedral.

84 The iconography of these urns is discussed in the next chapter.

85 The numbering system employed here differs from that given in Smith and Riall 2002; my reasoning for this decision is given below.

panel was originally two panels similar to those either side (fig. 106).[86] Some of the pieces in the upper tier are crucial to our understanding of the frieze both in terms of its design and layout as well as in identifying whose patronage was responsible for its creation.

The Morning Chapel upper tier (figs 101-104)

In its current state, the upper tier in the Morning Chapel is quite meaningless, nothing here is in its original position and few pieces in individual frames actually belong together. When, however, this part of the frieze is treated as a jig-saw puzzle then it becomes more significant. The panels were photographed individually with a 200mm scale included in each picture. These images were then computer-processed, printed out at a scale of 1:20, cut up into pieces and thereafter treated in the same manner as a jig-saw puzzle. It is nevertheless probably correct to describe these panels as they are currently arranged, and the description, which follows for the upper tier, provides the basic outline of the pieces here and these will be examined in greater detail when the reconstructed panels are described. The pieces are numbered sequentially, from 1 to 28, on the basis that there is no relevance to their present position within individual frames of the Morning Chapel frieze that reflects their original positions. The reconstruction of the panels represented in the Morning Chapel is discussed below.[87] By contrast, it is quite probable that the framework within which these pieces are displayed is substantially original, although at least two of the corbel figurines cannot now be in their original settings.

86 It is likely that these panels were cut-down and fitted together when they were first incorporated into the composite panel and when this was fitted above the door into the Morning Chapel. As this section was then placed high above the doorway, the presence of the 'missing' post would not have impeded access to this chapel.

87 See p. 184 ff.

The Morning Chapel lower tier (figs 105-107)

The lower tier panels in the Morning Chapel draw upon motifs present in the north and south lower tier panels to produce a third design. A central motif of a wide, squat lobed urn from which emerges a winged putto's head stands on a tri-lobed floral motif from which scrollwork leads out into cornucopiae. A pair of birds, addorsed, with one foot upraised are set with their backs to the urns and pecking into the cornucopias; the birds here do not have the horn-like ears present in the north frieze.

Capital and pilaster detail (figs 109-111)

The vertical posts have moulded edges and a columnar appearance. A decorative pilaster is carved into the timber of each post and each of these is surmounted by a capital. Eighteen capitals have survived, with a further capital (17), in the Morning Chapel, having been lost probably since its removal from the chancel. The capitals are all based on a single overall design, a pair of volutes – both out-turned and in-turned volutes are present – spread across the width of the capital in variants of U or V shapes and intermingled with other devices and motifs that are capped with a beaded rim. The volutes have slashed decoration that echoes the style employed in the main panels while the treatment of the curling tails of the volutes is again an echo of the main panels in the way that some are tied together while others emerge from fronds or foliate details. The volutes emerge from a central leaf that is clasped by a further, external, leaf that is based on the design of an acanthus leaf, although heavily stylised. The top of the capital ends with a chamfered and concave pediment that reflects the classical origins of these capitals. Similar capitals appear in Silkstede's frieze in Winchester cathedral but are otherwise absent in Hampshire contexts.

The capitals are a combination of classic Ionic and Corinthian types that were re-worked in Renaissance Italianate designs to provide a general style that was copied in both French and English work. Thus the capitals from St Cross would fit comfortably into the work at Gaillon, as do the strings of candelabra motifs in the

pilasters. The capitals seem to have all been carved from individual pieces of oak that were fixed to the framework, unlike the pilasters which were carved into the body of each post. The capitals have also a three-dimensional quality in that the carving of each is taken round the sides of these pieces to provide a greater depth to the work. The capital designs that are repeated can be seen, on close inspection, to have minute differences one from the next so that, in reality, all the capitals are in fact different despite the degree of verisimilitude about a number of them. This accords with the overall feel of the frieze where symmetry was all-important but, at the same time, it was possible to incorporate differences of detail without those differences unbalancing the symmetrical quality of the design.

The eighteen capitals can be grouped into eight different designs as follows:

1 and 3

2

4, 5, 9, 12 and 16

6, 8, 10, 11, 13, and 14

7

15

18

19

Table 3: St Cross. Capital design types, numbered from left to right, north then south frieze, with the Morning Chapel last (and see figs 1-3).

The pilasters are similarly based on a repetitive design which, when examined closely, is seen to be formed from a series of differing motifs so that no two posts are exactly the same. The basic design for each pilaster is based on a candelabrum suspended, in a wide variety of ways, from the top of each pilaster and onto which are carved a series of motifs that is continued onto the lower tier. Some 54 designs appear amongst the candelabra and these include floral, fruit and foliate designs amongst ribbons, tassels, and beads together with a few examples of military

N1*	N1	N2	N3	N4	N5	N6	N7
	H1	H2	H3	H4	H5	H5	H6
?	1	5	11	14	18	23	26
?	2	6	7	16	19	24	27
?		7	12				
X	3	8	13	1	20	15	28
X	4	9	14	17	21	22	
X		10	15		22		
X	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7

S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	S6	S7	S7*
H7	H8	H9	H9	H4	H10	H11	
26	31	21	37	37	29	31	18
29	22	33	38	39	13	22	13
22	15	14	22	25	35		?
		34			41		
30	29	35	13	37	37*	42	X
	13	36	31	22	21	38	X
	21	15	14	40	22	43	X
	32				15		
C8	C9	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	X

MC1	MC2	MC3	MC4	MC5
H5	X	H12	H13	H14
14	37	49	51	53
44	46	21	14	33
	47	22		
	15	50		
		21		
37	46	X	51	54
45	37	X	52	55
16	22	X		
	48	X		
C15	C16	X	C17	C18

* H10 re-occurs at top of lower part of S6

Table 4: Chapel at St Cross Hospital, renaissance frieze: distribution of motifs across the pilasters. N1* and S1* are the side faces of these posts and are carved only on the top tier. C1, C2 etc refer to the corbel figures as they are currently dispersed. There is no bottom tier post for MC3.

weapons (figs 109-111). The pilasters provide a large group of motifs that can be shown to have been based on designs to be seen in the Gaillon and Rouen woodwork of the early 1500s, and, through them, to Italian models. These motifs are discussed further below.[88]

Corbel figurines following Carter's numbering (*cf* fig 5)

While it is possible to read religious symbolism into many of the images on the frieze, the corbel figurines provide the only fully overt exemplification of belief.

The description and numeric sequence given here follows that given by Carter and Milner in 1790, on the basis that this probably represents the original layout – describing the sequence as it is seen today from north to south would anyway be incorrect as it is now known that the frieze has been incorrectly reinstalled in the chancel, and as has been previously noted, the north side should be on the south and *vice versa.* Table 7 (see page 221) gives the numeric sequence as the corbel figurines appear today.

The corbel figurines are approximately 150mm in height and between 45 and 50mm in thickness. They are suspended from the bottom of the pilaster posts by a pegged tongue. Each figurine is capped by a five-sided polygonal moulding, and each has the drapery of its clothing drawn up to form a backdrop to the figure. They were all originally provided with scrolls, some of which have since been lost, on which were once painted suitable mottoes or quotations that would have identified each portrait. There are nine female figures who can be seen as sibyls, six of whom carry identifiable Instruments of the Passion, and nine men who are considered to represent Old Testament prophets and kings. None of the latter has any attribute, making them virtually impossible to identify.[89]

Amongst his sketch drawings of St Cross, Carter wrote notes making references to corbels '7, 8 and 9 being on the north side' [90] and '16, 17 and 18 on the south side' [91] which clearly implies that Carter's illustration of the figurines, and

88 See Chapter 7, pp. 195-214 below.
89 The possibilities are discussed in Chapter 8, p. 215 ff.
90 BL Add MS 29928 f128. These are now 12, 13 and 14 on the south frieze
91 *Ibid.* f130. Now N7, MC17 and MC18.

Milner's description, follow the series sequentially - starting on the north and working from left to right around the group. This as I discussed above substantiates the reasoning behind re-arranging the frieze and stalls from their present situation so that when originally erected the north stalls and frieze were set along the south side of the chancel and the south stalls and frieze on the north.

The corbel figurines are of sufficient interest to be discussed separately, and I have devoted Chapter 8 below to this topic.

Heraldry and the patron of the frieze

The presence of the remains of four or five heraldic shields in the fragments in the Morning Chapel, alongside the medallions that show pelicans *vulning*, offer an identification of the patron of the frieze and, by extension, of the entire furnishing composed of stalls, desks and frieze. One of the shields carries the Tudor rose. Three further shields, the fragment in panel MC4 (fig. 104) is composed of pieces from two shields, bear the arms of the see of Winchester which is here shown as *two keys addorsed bendwise and between them a sword bendwise sinister*, although a reverse device is commonly shown in early sixteenth century contexts in Winchester Cathedral. A peculiar problem with the depiction of the arms of the see of Winchester is their very diversity of design and pattern, and this not over a long period, say a century or more, but within the episcopate of Fox himself. His pelican device is much in evidence in the cathedral; it is festooned across the presbytery screen, quire vault and his chantry chapel,[92] as is also the combined arms of his pelican and the heraldry of the see of Winchester. Additionally, the see arms are displayed alone. This range of heraldic display may offer clues to the date when the frieze was constructed or, at the very least, perhaps place the frieze in the sequence of developments in the Cathedral. The range of the see arms is shown in figure 113 and clearly the St Cross variant is most closely a parallel of the quire vault bosses, which date to 1503-9.[93] The

92 The multiplicity of Fox's arms, which are shown with a whole range of royal, Tudor and personal arms of the Tudor royal family, is very much a parallel of the Tudor practice of displaying their arms in their efforts to promote their legitimacy to the Crown.

93 Smith 1996, 21.

pelican in the St Cross heraldry is without parallel in the Cathedral although it is very much in the same idiom as the other fantastic birds in the frieze; it is nonetheless something of a problem that if craftsmen who carved the frieze could be relied upon to represent accurately the see arms then why the differences with the pelican? This may offer a clue that the frieze was not carved in England at all but was created in France.

A fifth shield, and two medallions in the chancel, bears a pelican. Two early-Tudor clerics used the pelican in their heraldic arms: Robert Sherborne and Richard Fox. Both were associated with St Cross. Sherborne was Master of St Cross from 1492 until 1505. He spent much of his time abroad, particularly in Rome, on embassies for Henry VII, but he was responsible for building works at St Cross some of which are identifiable today from the presence of his initial and motto, *Dilexi Sapientam* (I have loved wisdom) cut into stonework and painted onto glass. Sherborne was later bishop of St Davids before being translated to Chichester (1508-36). His tomb in Chichester cathedral incorporates his heraldic device, which can be seen to be that of a pelican in its nest, heraldically described as *in piety*.

The St Cross pelican is described as *vulning;* this was the device that Richard Fox used from early in his episcopal career. Many examples of the pelican *vulning* can be seen amongst Fox's works in Winchester Cathedral, particularly on bosses in the Quire vault, and on the Presbytery screen.[94] Fox was the *ex officio* Prelate of the Order of the Garter, and as such was permitted to marshall his arms within the Garter badge though neither this nor his motto *Est Deo Gratia* ('It is thanks to God') appears on the St Cross frieze. We can therefore discount Sherborne and look to Richard Fox as the patron of the frieze and its associated furnishings at St Cross. It is nonetheless interesting to note that Sherborne could have been well aware of artistic developments in Rome at the turn of the century; he may have seen the sibyls in the Carafa chapel of Sta Maria sopra Minerva and indeed have known some of the artists who explored the Neronian wall paintings in the grottoes in the Domus Aurea and the work which they produced as a result of their subterranean discoveries. In later years Sherborne was to be associated in Chichester with the artist Lambert Barnard, who painted ceiling vaults in the cathedral and the nearby church of

94 For the Presbytery screen, Biddle 1993, 270-4; for the bosses, Smith 1996.

Boxgrove Priory as well as for the bishop's palaces in Chichester and nearby Amberley Castle, all with Renaissance motifs and style.[95]

The sole obvious reference to the Tudors is the shield bearing a Tudor rose although, as noted above, it is possible that the lower tier panel N5b alludes to Catherine of Aragon through the possible inclusion of a pomegranate (fig. 93). The royal arms are absent from the heraldry in the frieze, though clearly much detail has been lost.[96]

Connecting the frieze to Bishop Fox would possibly explain the profusion of fantastic birds in the frieze – we may note in passing that both Fox's chantry and Presbytery screen are festooned with pelicans – but, more importantly, permits the frieze to be seen in the wider background of Fox's Renaissance-styled art patronage in Winchester cathedral and, by extension of Fox's political contacts, to work of a similar style in France.

The heraldry amongst the ornamentation of the frieze also offers some indications for dating. Fox died in 1528, thus the use of his heraldic badge offers a *terminus post quem* for the work. This is almost certainly a decade too late. The problem of dating the frieze is however best left until later in this work and is therefore discussed below.[97]

The chancel furnishings

Apart from the sibyls and prophets, there is nothing overtly religious about the St Cross frieze. The presence of classical urns that might be interpreted as representative of chalices, of dolphins that could echo Christian sentiments of everlasting life and other elements of classical imagery that also mirror Christian values need not carry with it the implication that this was from the first designed for an ecclesiastical setting as can be shown by examining pieces of Flemish furniture of

95 Croft-Murray 1962, 23-25, 153-55.

96 The presence of what are probably a pair of lions in MC2 (R9) are shown here to have been set either side of the crossed swords indicating the see of Winchester. These would more comfortably fit Royal heraldry, thus the interpretation given here may be incorrect and MC2/R9 should actually be seen as the supporters to either the full Royal arms or a Royal badge.

97 See pp. 228-245.

the same period which bear the same range of classical designs.[98] Connecting the frieze to a set of furnishings for a chapel does however carry with it the implication that the selection of the motifs present in the frieze depended in some measure on a Christian connection.

The stalls

Something has already been said about the style and design of the stalls above, but the section which follows is intended to serve as a complete description. The stalls are of a form that was not uncommon in late medieval England and can be seen in a wide range of settings from parish church to major ecclesiastical buildings as well as in private chapels (e.g. Abergavenny church, Christchurch priory, and the chapel of The Vyne) although all of these were equipped with individual tipping seats with, normally, misericords. At St Cross, the stalls provide a plain bench *c.*3.9 m long, with a back formed by a series of plain panels, *c.*0.5 m wide and *c.*1.1 m high. They are contained within a framework of posts, 0.8 mm thick, that have simple, semi-round, rebated mouldings, 10-12 mm wide and 5-8 mm deep, along two adjacent sides of each edge (i.e. the outer surface of the posts and the post-face against the panel) for decoration and capped by an architrave rail with complex moulding. Above this is a curved canopy with ribs that is fronted by architrave rails of recent date.[99] The junction of each line of moulding, vertical with horizontal, is marked by a square rebate which is set either side of the pegging points of the frame. This rebated moulding is a common factor in the decoration of the stalls, desks and frieze. The canopy is similarly divided into compartments by moulded ribs. As seen today the stalls stand some 2 .2 m high. The back of the stalls are panelled with boards set vertically between posts set 0.55 – 0.58 m apart, while the canopy has narrower boards set horizontally and these are pinned to a framework that extends up the

98 Many of the motifs used at St Cross appeared earlier in the stonework at Gaillon, at Andelys and at Blois in domestic, if palatial, settings that cannot be expected to carry a religious message.

99 It is not known when the architrave was fixed to the front of the canopied benches but this must have occurred after the frieze was dismantled by Butterfield thus this feature may be Victorian.

back of the stalls (and cannot be seen) and extends outwards above the canopy (figs 4 and 61).

The east end panel of each of the canopied stalls was made in the same manner although both appear to have been cut-down at some point (possibly in the Victorian period but maybe before Butterfield's renovations at St Cross?) as the characteristic rebate decoration on these panels is absent at the junction between the back and end panels (figs 66, 67 and 68). Additionally, the architrave running along the base of the canopy is displaced at this junction which, in view of the general quality of the carpentry of the work here, is surprising and is best explained by alterations to the arrangement of the stall. The end panel projects at right-angles from the back of the stall and extends for about 250 mm. The corner post is then turned at an angle of about $110^0 - 120^0$; only 75 mm of this angled post survives on the north bench, with 65mm on the south. Nevertheless this is sufficient to show the presence of the rebated moulding, the continuation of the architrave at the base of the canopy and the presence of a vertical slot cut into the edge of this panel which was presumably intended to accommodate the next panel.

The west end panels of the stalls are both set at right-angles to the end of the canopied bench, and are devoid of any mouldings or decoration internally. Externally, these panels are filled with linenfold panelling though of a different type to that present in the desks. Linenfold panelling is also present in the exterior of east end of the south stall but not in the north, and is the material used for the front of the desks (fig. 65).

The desks

Two desks survive in the chancel (figs 1 and 2), with the remains of one, perhaps two, in the Morning Chapel and another in the nave. Each of these desks originally had carvings on the end boards, five of which have survived and all are dolphins in a grotesque style. Six desks had survived intact by the start of the twentieth century as can be seen from an early photograph showing the desks and stalls in the Morning Chapel (fig. 64). Soon after, two of the desks were moved back to the chancel but the dolphin terminals that had previously adorned each end of two of

the desks had been removed and, as now, fitted one apiece to each of four desks: two presently in the nave and two in the Morning Chapel, a fifth dolphin terminal forming a wall bracket on the south wall of this chapel alongside the altar.

The desks are formed by freestanding pieces of furniture that are characterised by linenfold panels set into panels with posts that are decorated with semi-round mouldings that are also present on the frieze and stalls (fig. 65). The linenfold panels are 185 mm wide by 1.2 m high. The linenfold in the desks matches that used in the south stall east end panel, but differs from the linenfold used elsewhere in the stalls. The posts are of the same dimensions as those in stalls, and, we may note, that the pegging of the posts to the stiles (fig. 68) matches the method used in the stalls. The end panels of the desks have mostly been re-cut and, in the case of the Morning Chapel, have been dismantled and replaced in different positions, with the desks themselves cut-down.

The dolphin terminals have all been removed from their original settings and reattached to the end boards of the desks so that none are now in their original positions. The carving of each of these terminals was originally carried round and down the front of the desk end-boards. A fifth dolphin terminal is now used as a bracket to support a shelf beside the altar in the Morning Chapel (fig. 113).

The poppyhead desks

Three poppyhead desks are today arranged around the walls of the north transept. Each has been re-fitted and re-worked so that it is only the end-boards with their poppyheads that have survived from the Tudor period. One of the poppyheads features Fox's pelican and the arms of the see of Winchester. These poppyhead desks seem to have been re-fitted by Butterfield who used them in his original re-arrangement of the chancel; they are shown in the *ILN* and *Builder* engravings (figs 56 and 57). While it is possible that they once formed the end-boards for the other desks, the combination of dolphins, carved in a new artistic idiom both in terms of the sculpture itself and in the overall shape and pattern of the terminal, with poppyheads that are very traditional seems altogether unlikely. The presence of the poppyhead benches makes some sense of the early antiquarians' and historians'

musive comments about old furnishings (i.e. the poppyheads) being replaced by the Renaissance suite.[100] The poppyhead desks may well have been brought to St Cross from St Faith's or, indeed, may have formed part of the furnishings in the nave which, from 1507, served as the church for the parish of St Faith's.

4. The frieze and chancel furnishings reconstructed

This section brings together the various pieces of woodwork and explores how they may be fitted together. The basis for this reconstruction accepts the written accounts that state there were originally places for sixteen persons and that the whole suite of work was approximately semi-circular in shape, which is taken here to mean a U-shape formed by short lengths of work with well-defined angles between each section of work. Analysis of the Morning Chapel composite offers some clues to the full extent of the frieze. This section begins with a description of the composite and the individual frames that may be created from it, and then goes on to explore how all this may be fitted back together.

The Morning Chapel composite – unscrambled and reconstructed

The 28 pieces of carved wood displayed in the Morning Chapel clearly represent a number of panels from the frieze and even a cursory examination reveals that there are designs here that are not present in the chancel sections. The four upper frames in the Morning Chapel (figs 101-104) were photographed with a 200mm scale and these photographs were printed out at a 1:20 scale. The photographs were then cut up to show individual pieces and the resulting material then treated like a jig-saw puzzle to which were added similarly treated pieces from the north section in the chancel. This exercise produced a minimum of 10 new frames leaving a number of fragments. The individual pieces were sorted and matched with material either

100 See Woodward 1860, 225

from the Morning Chapel or from material in the north chancel section of the frieze to produce a series of reconstructed frames (R1-R10) as follows.

MC1	**MC3**
1 as N6u left edge, R11	14 R3
2 as N3u bottom left corner	15 not placed
3 R5, R6	16 not placed
4 not placed	17 R5, R6
5 not placed	18 not placed
6 R6	19 R2
7 R12	
8 R3, R4	**MC4**
9 R12	20 R1 (with N3u)
	21 R5, R6
MC2	22 not placed, lower tier – new design
10 R9	23 not placed
11 R7, R8	24 R9, R10
12 R7, R8	25 R9, R10
13 R9, R10	26 R7, R8
	27 not placed
	28 R3, R4

Table 5: St Cross. Morning Chapel fragments placed in new frames R1-R10.

Reconstructed frames

R1 (fig. 114) A compressed ogee arch frames a plain slashed medallion (this is noticeably plain compared with the medallions in the main frieze sections) featuring a woman in profile facing right - this medallion is currently in N3 - supported by a pair of affronted winged, mythical creatures. The hind-quarters and rear legs of these creatures are similar to the animals featured in S1u and S4u. The heavy wings

of these creatures suggest identification with Pegasus or a winged sphinx.[101] This frame at 250mm (*c.*10 inches) is narrower than the main series of frames. The bottom part of the finial of the arch survives and reveals a crocket formed from suspended leaves; this may well have been the original design throughout the frieze. A paw is just visible on the right hand side of the foliage of the finial. This creature appears also to have had a scroll extended from its stomach area similar to the treatment of some of the birds, cf N3u.

R2 (fig. 114) A second frame similar to R1 but represented by only the right hand element. The arc of the surviving piece of medallion is such that it cannot fit R1. Note also differences of treatment to the wings and the presence of a scroll beneath the neck of R2 but which is not present in not R1. The medallion fragment fitted here to R2 is not an absolutely comfortable fit and may belong elsewhere.

R3 & R4 (figs 115 and 116) Fragments of two frames of a design similar to that present in S2, S3, S5 & S6 but with minor differences of detail in the treatment of the *putti* and of the decorative element beneath the putto above the arch. Given the rhythmic symmetry of the frames in the south section, it seems very probable that R3 & R4 represent a design departure, note that the putto in R3 is looking down to the left – the surviving putto in S6u is looking forward – and also in the south section frames there is more of a gap between the *putti* wings and the ogee arch, and also the angle of the wings differs. All minor detail, but given the exactitude of the symmetry in the frieze this is sufficient to suggest a design departure. R3 appears to have featured a wreathed medallion similar to S6u.

Four frames are based around a design that features a pair of large fantastic birds set on top of the ogee arch with a central shield supported by dolphins. The fragment in N1u provides the edge detail missing in the series R5-8. N1u does not belong with these R frames, note the floral motif in the extreme left and right corners (cf N3u) is not present in N1u and the curvature of the ogee arches do not match. It is of course feasible that the frame edge from N1u should be matched to R5-8 rather

101 A unicorn is also possible, I discuss this further below.

than those from N3u, although the point remains that there are two panel designs represented here.

R5 (fig. 117) The removal of the medallion from N3u (this medallion now features in R1) permits its replacement with the shield bearing the pelican, Bishop Fox's personal device. The frame appears to be slightly larger than the norm and was originally between 600mm and 650mm wide (23.5 – 25.5 inches). The shield is suspended from the ogee arch by ribbon-like labels and supported by affronted dolphins, their beaks tied together and supporting the shield. A pair of large, fantastic birds are placed above the arch and there are traces of further scrollwork. The same overall design also appears in R6. Note that the right foot of the bird shown on the left of the frame is standing with its talons clenched around a pebble-like object.

R6 (fig. 118) Similar to R5, this frame features a shield bearing the arms of the see of Winchester. Note the plume rising from the dolphin's head being rolled round into a ball-form; this is likely to have been used with the dolphins in R5.

R7 & R8 (figs 119 and 121) Two further frames based around the design of R5-R6 are evident amongst the fragments in the Morning Chapel. R7 features a shield bearing a Tudor rose.

R9 (fig. 120) A new design that is dominated by a pair of winged putti with trumpets shown astride maned creatures with hoofed rear legs and tails. These stand either side of the ogee arch which probably framed a shield bearing the arms of the see of Winchester which is, in turn, supported by a pair of addorsed dolphins. The scrollwork and balled plume attached to the shield fragment almost certainly should be interpreted as dolphins in this panel although the fit is less than perfect with the outer planks. The dolphins here are horned unlike those featured in R5-R8. The section of shield shown in R9 is currently shown "joined" to the shield in MC4u. Close observation reveals that the pieces do not match completely and that when

placed together the shield is asymmetrical. The left piece of shield is therefore deemed to be R10.

R10 (fig. 121) Another shield with the see of Winchester arms and probably supported by dolphins, note the ball to the left of the shield. This frame has traces of claws on top of the ogee arch and must therefore have had birds above the arch. The fragment of finial shown with R10 need not necessarily belong here but would belong in the same design group – note the bird claw close to the finial.

R11 (not illus). A small fragment of a fantastic creature with a pointed beak (?) emerging from slashed scrollwork and with floriated treatment to its upper torso and head. This parallels the motifs in the bottom corners of N4u and N6u but with differing treatment. This could be seen as a replacement to N1u which forms part of the R5-R8 (&?R10) series.

R12 Lower tier (figs 105-107) A new lower tier design based around an urn.

The frieze reconstructed

The presence of four posts with angled faces and the remnants of eleven frames in the Morning Chapel, combined with the spatial geometry of the chancel, and taking into account the details provided from the drawings made by Porden and Brough (fig. 4 and 60), and also from Dollman's plan (fig. 53), offers the potential to suggest a reconstruction of the frieze with its stalls and desks as they might originally have appeared (fig. 54).

There are a number of qualifications that must be taken into account if this reconstruction is to have any merit:

- the stone structure of the chancel was altered by Butterfield who stripped masonry away from the face of the pillars thereby increasing the space between the pillars.[102] This carries with it the implication that the stalls may not originally

[102] The point is readily demonstrated by reference to the 1818 engraving of the chancel (fig. 55) which shows the pillars of the chancel before Butterfield's mid nineteenth century

have stood against the chancel walls but were instead placed forward to a point close to the front of the piers.

- this placement allows the angled timber-work of the canopied benches and the frieze to be turned round the west pillars in one angle; this also reduces the running length of frieze required for the two full sections either side of the chancel.
- it would seem very unlikely that the two surviving sections of frieze in the chancel were ever anything other than six-frame straight lengths of frieze. They were not angled.
- the presence of eighteen corbel figurines, nine either side, in a series that almost certainly was always composed of nine and nine for iconographical and ideological reasons, presents the possibility that if the end posts of the frieze had no corbel, but all the remaining posts *were* provided with a corbel figurine then the maximum number of face frames in the frieze would be ten (either side of the chancel), with the possibility of return frames at either end of the frieze (ie at the east end of the canopied bench and at the west end either side of the entrance into the chancel).
- apart from the canopied bench with its desk, a further two benches and desks have to be incorporated into the suite of furnishings and overhung by the frieze. None of these individual desks now survives intact although the possibility that they did so early in the 20th century, when they were photographed in the Morning Chapel complete with dolphin terminals either side of the desk, has previously been noted. If these desks were then intact it follows that they cannot have been much wider than 1.2-1.4 metres as they were then placed either side of the door into the Morning Chapel which has implications for the running length of the frieze.
- it appears to have been an original requirement that provision was to be made for only sixteen stalls.

The massive pillars in the chancel and the constrictions of space imposed by the use of the east bay of the chancel for the altar, and the presence of the crossing

alterations and the photographs of the chancel which show the altered character of these pillars.

immediately west of the west pillars of the chancel, presented a situation that seems could only be resolved by resorting to the unusual layout of stalls and frieze set along an angled line.

The two crucial elements here are the angled posts and the nineteenth century description of the stall setting as semi-circular or U-shaped. The reconstruction suggested here requires 24 posts of which 19 survive with four of these being angled posts, with two of these now lost but which would have been set on the corner of the lateral range and the entrance into the chancel. This survival may seem altogether too much of a co-incidence; however it remains the case that even if more angled posts were present there would anyway be no use for them as the geometry of the timberwork could not encompass any further angles. We may conclude from this that the frieze was laid out in three sections, one long section nearly 4 metres long (this section crossing above the canopied stalls which still exist) with two shorter sections of *c.*1.20m and *c.*1.40m long, these producing as I noted above an approximately U-shaped structure which, allowing for literary licence, is not altogether incompatible with Duthy's semi-circular description. This arrangement makes sense of the sketch drawing done by Carter in 1789; he shows only part of the setting on the north side of the chancel and this includes an angled section rounding the west pier (figs 53 and 63).

The four angled posts produce a layout that, when reconstructed with the reconstructed frames, conforms to an approximate U-shape. The distance across the chancel, north to south, and the requirement to include a doorway into the chancel, taken with the detail we now have of the 'missing' frames allows us to see the frieze laid out as shown in the plan given here (fig. 54).

The length of frieze presently in the south side of the chancel would appear to be largely intact and, aside from minor damage, probably represents its original shape and pattern. The north side by contrast is much damaged. Frame N1u (fig. 77) and the planks either side of the medallion in frame N3u (fig. 79) belong with R5-R8 and (?) R10 (figs 117-121); the medallion in N3u belongs with a much narrower frame, R1 or R2 (figs 77 and 114). The symmetry of the south section suggests the north was similarly treated, thus corner fragments in frames MC-1 and MC-2 similar to those in frames N3u/N6u might indicate that there were three of these panels with

potentially three of the N2u/N5u type frames. Assuming that the north section was indeed symmetrically similar to the south, then together these two sections provide twelve surviving frames leaving ten frames wanting, if a simple run of frieze as shown in fig 54 is envisaged as the original setting. Matching together the fragments in the Morning Chapel with those from the north chancel section produces ten frames as well as a single lower tier frame.

That evidence for these ten frames should survive may seem very co-incidental, but it may be that the frieze originally extended down either side of the passage into the chancel, and Carter certainly seemed to indicate this in his sketch, which would have required a further four to six frames. Had the frieze been extended above the entry into the chancel, linking the two sets of stalls, then two or possibly three additional frames would have been required here. We may note also that notwithstanding the above, considerable parts of the frieze remain missing, including at least three medallions and, presumably, a minimum of seven bays of lower tier work.

The reconstruction suggested here is based on a minimum number with simplicity of arrangement preferred to over-complication. While the reconstructed frames are based on fragmentary pieces there is sufficient here to indicate that return frames could have been provided at the east end of the canopied benches: frames R1 and R2. The remaining eight frames would have been spread across the west side of the chancel probably in a symmetrical arrangement that placed a balanced series of frames, one of each, either side of the entrance into the chancel. They would seem almost certainly to have been paired in one shorter and one longer frame sections: thus R5 and R9, R3 and R7. It seems less likely that long frames were set together, with short frames together, in sections. There are otherwise no obvious clues as to the arrangement of these frames. The only non-symmetrical element would seem to have been the provision of only one frame bearing a Tudor rose and one bearing Fox's pelican, frames R8 and R5. Frame R7 is missing its shield – this might have borne the Royal arms, which in Winchester Cathedral figure prominently amongst the heraldic devices that Bishop Fox included in his schemes in the Quire vault and the vaults over the Quire aisles.

A further element that is significantly absent here is any reference to the Garter which Fox displayed with his own arms, and those of bishop and see, in many settings in the Cathedral. While R9 may have been intended to show trumpeting putti astride (?) lions with the see of Winchester arms it is possible that such a pairing would more comfortably fit with the display of the royal arms, and, notwithstanding the comments above as to where this panel may have been displayed, a display incorporating lions might more readily be seen as indicative of royal heraldry and this would most likely have taken centre-stage – thus being displayed over the entrance into the chancel. That said, angels with trumpets featured in Fox's great east window in the cathedral (fig. 121), alongside angels that hold shields suspended from ribbons on which are the heraldic devices of the four episcopal sees that Fox held.

Reconstruction – conclusion

The use of a three-sided setting with eight stalls either side of the chancel, employing angled posts in both frieze and canopied benches, to create a suite of furnishings leaves little doubt that the frieze was created from the first to adorn the church of the Hospital of St Cross. This arrangement would appear to be unique. While important in any study of church fittings, and St Cross has been completely ignored in this respect, it is however the profusion of Renaissance motifs in the frieze and the parallels with French models and the use of similar motifs in English contexts that is of wider interest.

* * *

This concludes the general description of the frieze at St Cross. In the next three chapters I discuss specific facets of the frieze: the motifs, the sybils and the Gaillon-St Cross connection alongside the problem of dating the St Cross frieze. The one, over-arching, conclusion that I would wish to take on from this chapter is that the frieze at St Cross was an isolated piece of work that has no directly comparable

analogue in England which strongly suggests that it was either created in France or that its creators having made the frieze at St Cross then left the country. The only surviving work that appears to be based on the St Cross frieze was, first, a frieze made for Prior Silkstede in Winchester cathedral and, later, the moulds that were carved to create terracotta panels for tombs such as that of Lord Marney at Layer Marney.

Chapter 7:

St Cross frieze – motifs and meanings

THE FRIEZE AT ST CROSS IS FILLED with fantastic creatures and other motifs carved in the *all'antica* style. Fantastic is here understood to differentiate the fantastic creations of the frieze designers from the realistic portrayal of naturally occurring animals and objects. There is no attempt at verisimilitude with nature to be seen in the St Cross frieze, but rather a surreal mingling of geometric shapes with animal shapes which are reduced to incredible caricatures. That said, there are occasional hints at the natural world, for example in the treatment of the birds' claws and legs and, if less obviously, in their wings. However, we would be hard pressed to identify specific species of any of the animals or birds. Size is not seen as a factor in determining individual motifs, as these were scaled up or down as required to suit the setting and, additionally, individual motifs were not scaled in any ratio with other motifs within individual designs: thus putti, birds and dolphins in a single frame clearly did not conform to any sensible understanding of scale.

This nonsensical approach to scale can be seen as an element of fantasy and of the whole idea of *all'antica*. There is then a sense of whimsy, as well as a certain sense of the formulaic about the work at St Cross into which is also merged some iconographic symbolism drawn from the range of symbols used to display Christian ideas and values. Somewhat problematically, many of the motifs that could be deemed as potentially being examples of Christian iconography also occurred in the lexicon of classical motifs and which therefore had altogether different values. Thus

the dolphin was associated with religion long before Christianity and pre-dated both classical Rome and Greece having emerged in the Mycenaean civilisation. The urn and the peacock also have a long tradition of use. However, while we may observe that there are classical cultural associations to be discovered, we can be reasonably certain that in the St Cross setting the motifs were intended to have an overtly Christian message.

Not all the work in such friezes is based on fantastic creatures but relies instead upon geometric designs also taken from classical sources, such as volutes and capitals, which were then incorporated amongst fantastic creatures and further mixed with foliate work that can be seen as having derived in part from Gothic sources. We may note also that the rectilinear layout we might expect from designs based on classical sources is however mixed with curvaceous lines taken from Gothic work, such as the ogee frames that characterise the St Cross frieze. While it is possible to define individual motifs based on fantastic creatures, it is less easy to categorise the scrollwork and general curvilinear elements that bind the designs together even though these elements are themselves especially characteristic of *all'antica* work. It is in fact this rather amorphous work that would be reused and taken into the designs for the work executed on the Winchester Cathedral presbytery screen friezes and elsewhere. It would be tempting to describe this work as rinceaux, upon which it is obviously based, but the work at St Cross is of a very different form to that we would expect amongst Gothic work. Rinceaux were also part and parcel of the classical style which anyway underpins the whole essence of the *all'antica* style.

The bulk of the fantastic creatures comprise a range of identifiably different birds, although only one can be identified as a species although even this is an unnatural representation, alongside depictions of dolphins which while offering variations can still be understood as essentially the same creature. Three further animals appear, one is a dog which is perhaps a greyhound, while another may be a lion; both can be interpreted as heraldic badges relating to the Tudors. Lastly, there is a sphinx. The remaining identifiable motifs, apart from the putti, are urns and masks.

Something must be said about the restrictions that carving in open-work creates when we come to compare motifs from the St Cross and Silkstede friezes with work in France, especially at Gaillon where the work was executed in relief on whole panels, whether in stone or in wood.[1] The Cross frieze was created in open-work, that is, the carving created a semi three-dimensional effect by carving completely through the wooden planks of the frieze and thereby allowing light and shade to enhance the overall texture and feel of the work. The work at Gaillon provided for carving in light-relief which, while not having the fuller sculptural appearance of the St Cross work, allowed a much finer line to be achieved in the carving.

Leaving aside the fact that the Gaillon work is carved to a tremendously high standard while the work at St Cross is of a lesser quality, we may note that in the Gaillonesque work the execution of line is very accomplished for its precision of accuracy, its symmetry and its fineness of curve. Where tendrils escape from individual motifs, such as the plumes from dolphins, the curls of rinceaux or the work around flowers and leaves, the French carvers were able to aspire to very fine, whispy lines that the carvers of the St Cross frieze could not hope to achieve. Comparison of *cloiture* work from Gaillon, where pilasters with candelabra and capitals similar to those at St Cross were employed, shows the level of skill achieved by the French carvers. This offers a helpful benchmark showing that the work at St Cross was not far distant in quality to that at Gaillon when we are able to fully compare like with like.

The St Cross frieze is covered in a range of motifs that are drawn from classical sources, modified through the prism of Renaissance artists and designers in Italy and France, and organised in an English setting by craftsmen of unknown nationality. The frieze can be determined as one of a kind in the sense that there is no other work quite like it in England. That is not to say that there are not pieces that can be deemed to derivative, as may be seen in the work created for Prior Silkstede in Winchester Cathedral. There is however no comparable work on the same scale as St Cross, nothing that features a major group of medallions and figurines set within

1 Save for Evreux where the screens are open-work, pers. obs.

a single scheme of work. One reason for examining these motifs in detail is that this potentially allows us some insights into who may have carved the frieze at St Cross.

Who carved the frieze at St Cross?

The frieze at St Cross stands alone, one of a type with virtually no parallel in England and only one strikingly comparable piece in France – the stalls at Gaillon. Many of the individual motifs at St Cross parallel those to be seen in settings at Gaillon and Evreux,[2] some of the parallels are almost exact copies while others are strongly reminiscent of them. I believe this suggests most strongly that whoever designed and carved the St Cross work was familiar with the carved work at Gaillon. This may mean that whoever designed the St Cross frieze did so in France or was only briefly in England. But this does not finalise the problem as it should have been feasible for well-trained carvers to copy the work and create further pieces similar to the St Cross frieze elsewhere. The lack of such parallels suggests that whoever carved this frieze either did so in France, or did so in England but left for parts unknown, having completed their work; additionally, they may have died though to lose an entire team of craftsmen to disease seems somewhat improbable. The quality of the work is not of the order of that at Gaillon, where a very high standard was achieved and where also the technically exacting craft of marquetry-work formed an important part of the work. When however we look at the analogues of the St Cross frieze we find that issues of quality have a negative trend: the frieze for Silkstede and the carving of the moulds for the East Anglian tombs being quite inferior to the work seen at St Cross. This too reflects back on St Cross, further emphasising how isolated as a piece of work the St Cross frieze is when seen in the context of the application of the *all'antica* style in early Tudor England.

Without any documentation to back up a case for identifying the craftsmen similar to that for the work at Gaillon, we must fall back on drawing comparisons between the two main friezes. I suggest that whoever created the St Cross work had

[2] The ambulatory and chancel screens at Evreux are not much discussed in any of the literature but these bear a strong resemblance to the work at Gaillon and should be seen as derivative of that work. The quality of the Evreux work is much better than that executed at St Cross, pers. obs.

either seen and studied the frieze at Gaillon, may even possibly have been a member of the team who worked there, and then created the St Cross frieze. I further suggest that this formed his (probably not their as I suspect the work was the product of a single master-craftsman) only major work. My view is that because there are comparable motifs in both sets of work, some of which are very small indeed, alongside strikingly close parallels to be seen between the overall designs of individual panels, we should not be seeking an explanation by reference to prints or other forms of disseminating these motifs, nor indeed contemplating the possibility that a cartoon was drawn in France specifically for Fox.

Of especial interest here are the horned creatures that so characterise the St Cross frieze, in particular the dolphins. At Gaillon these are clearly and deliberately carved to represent horns, complete with a well-defined spiral twist. But at St Cross the horns are quite crude and have no trace of the Gaillonesque style, while in the Silkstede frieze and Marney tomb they are even cruder.[3] Nonetheless, the horns which characterise the St Cross frieze are hardly seen elsewhere in England apart from the sites cited above. It should be noted that such horned creatures are similarly very rare in French contexts, which further emphasises the link to be seen between the sets of work.[4] This topic is discussed in greater detail below.[5]

Both ranges of stalls were created for small chapels and both were closely associated with major ecclesiastical figures: Cardinal-Archbishop Georges d'Amboise at Gaillon and Bishop Richard Fox at St Cross. Gaillon was the summer palace of the Rouen archbishopric whilst St Cross seems to have been partially appropriated as a 'retreat' by Fox. We might therefore identify both sets of work as having been created in what were essentially private chapels rather than in public settings, such as within the context of a cathedral. This has a bearing on the constituent parts of the works and how we should visualise them. In these contexts, the settings formed part of the furnishings for private chapels, and doubtless the selection of designs and motifs used in these works was modified by this central

3 The Silkstede frieze is described below; dolphins and birds with horns are depicted in the canopy of the tomb of the first Lord Marney at Layer Marney, Essex.

4 Horned creatures only appear in work at Gaillon and Evreux and occasionally in Rouen, they are absent from the *all'antica* work at Fécamp; pers. obs.

5 See p. 230 ff.

consideration. So that, while there is a range of classical imagery and a profusion of motifs that seem to have no overt significance there remains a strong probability that in the St Cross frieze there is more than a hint of intentional Christian iconography. This point could be over-emphasised as there is a case also to suggest that given the nature of *all'antica* work it was inevitable that a range of classical motifs would have to be used and that many could carry Christian connotations but which were not originally intended to carry any such messages. In other words, the art form itself was capable of carrying messages that were not *per se* intentional and we should therefore exercise some caution in being overly prescriptive in identifying Christian symbols where, in fact, there need not have been any.

St Cross motifs

Dolphins

Along with the fantastic birds, the dolphin is the most frequently depicted motif in the St Cross frieze, making at least 47 appearances. The dolphin featured in Minoan art, Greek myth and legend and was a frequent motif employed in classical Roman art, before being adopted by the early Christians with the earliest known examples of the motif used in a Christian context coming from the catacombs of Rome. According to Webber, in pre-Christian contexts 'The dolphin was said to bear the souls of the righteous across the sea to the land of the blest', and this probably explains why dolphins often featured on classical sarcophagi.[6] Additionally, because the dolphin had gained a reputation of saving sailors from the sea (and see the legend of Arion for an early example of this, one that was often depicted in Roman

6 Webber 1927, 85.

art with putti shown riding dolphins)[7], dolphins were seen as signifiers both of salvation and of resurrection, thus symbolic of Christ.[8]

It is of some interest in the context of St Cross to note that in the constellation Delphinus there are nine stars. This can be seen as corresponding with the number of Muses, but in the St Cross programme there may be a case for suggesting a link with the two series of nine corbels featuring sibyls and prophets – all of which are inextricably bound up with foretelling the birth of Christ. Dolphins could also be considered within the tradition of depicting fish as carrying a Christian message but, given that the fish carved in the St Cross scheme can clearly be seen as intentionally depicting dolphins, we can perhaps stay with the closer symbolism as associated with the dolphin, rather than a more general understanding that is pertinent with the collective symbol as depicted by fish.[9]

The dolphins in the St Cross frieze are all depicted with the head and part of the torso – the tails are entirely missing. The treatment of the head/face area of the animal is consistent throughout the range of dolphins seen here and consists of a series of layers which seem to aim at giving the animal a three-dimensional, rounded shape. There is a strong emphasis on the area around the eye which is forcefully presented; this echoes the classical origin of the motif and may perhaps relate to the idea of the 'all seeing eye' or 'the evil eye', an idea that is still common in modern day Turkey and the Middle East where glass eyes are frequent gifts.

7 Lempriere, in his classical dictionary, relates that Arion was a famous lyric poet and musician who achieved fame and riches at the court of Periander. After some time Arion wished to return home; and the sailors of the ship in which he embarced resolved to murder him to obtain his riches. Arion begged that he might sing before he was flung in the sea. His singing attracted a number of dolphins to the ship and one of them carried Arion safely to shore, when he returned to Periander's court who ordered all the sailors to be crucified on their return. The story is thought to underlie the frequent depiction of a boy with a lyre astride a dolphin. In a Christian context the story of Arion can be seen as a parable showing Arion moving through an anxious and violent world to immortality through the mediation of the dolphins. It is not difficult to link this to Christ the Saviour.

8 On dolphins in Christian art; see Hall 1996, and www.delphinus.com.

9 The bibliography for symbolism concerning fish is huge, for a concise view see Taylor 2003, 188-89; Hall (1996) observed that Christian believers 'were called little fishes *pisciculi* and from this, the font, *picina* – literally a fish-pond.' Given the number of fishes scattered through the St Cross frieze it may be that Fox intended a certain ambiguity and that to see the dolphins as fish is not entirely without merit.

Dolphin body shape (fig 122).

The body of the dolphin in this frieze is generally carved to show four principal layers:

1 a top layer formed by a denticulated leafy shape that leads back from the wide-open mouth and incorporates the eye and terminating with a three-pointed, triangular leaf.[10] This is strikingly similar to the motifs 3 and 26 in the pilaster series.

2 a leaf-like layer that emerges from beneath the head (1) to form a plume that curls above the dolphin's head. Like the first element, this layer terminates in a three-pointed, denticulated shape, but here is upward pointing.

3 a scroll that again emerges from beneath the top layer (1) which here curls beneath the body and terminates in a ball finial, this rolling forward toward the dolphin's mouth.

4 the last element is another leafy layer and this forms the top or back of the dolphin. Like the other layers, this also has a leaf-like appearance and is pointed and denticulated.

Dolphin 1 [N3u, R5, R9] This is the most typical form of the animal here. In N3u the body is attached to a slashed volute (close to the body of the dolphin the slashes are ovoid, but further out they are rectangular) and used as the basal supporter to the central medallion. The mouth is very wide open in this arrangement. In R5 (fig 117) a scroll with a ball-terminal projects from the head whereas in R9 (fig 120) the upper-lip is extended out and upwards to support a shield .

Dolphin 2 [N4u, N6u] Similar to dolphin 1, but here there is no top plume and the lower scroll has a somewhat modified appearance.

Dolphin 3 [S1u, S4u] Similar to dolphin 2. Here the upper jaw of the beak is magnified and extended while the lower jaw is truncated.

Dolphin 4 [S2u, S3u, S5u, S6u] Simplified version of dolphin 2 and dolphin 3 but with no attached slashed scrollwork, instead the body layer 3 is considerably

10 While one might contemplate three here, I think this should be resisted as it is more likely that the intention was symmetry

extended to provide a 'seat' for the putto above, and terminates in a ball-finial which is held by the putto.

Dolphin 5 [S1-S6 lower, R9] Horned dolphin. This is based on dolphin types 1 and 4, to which have been added the characteristic horns. There is some variation in the execution of the carving of the horns.

Five further individual dolphins also appear on the desk ends (with one now truncated and used as a shelf bracket beside the altar in the Morning Chapel). Two show traces of horns but these desk terminals are very worn (fig 113).

Fantastic birds (fig 124)

Six types of birds feature in the frieze and, unlike the dolphins which can be seen as a single species of animal, each of the birds possibly represents a particular bird but given the unnatural nature of the depiction it is not possible to clearly identify what these were intended to be. The presence of horns on some of the birds probably represents a design parallel to the horned dolphins; it is unlikely that these birds were intended to reflect one of the bat or owl species. That said, some of the birds can be suggested as representing the pelican used by Bishop Fox as his heraldic badge, others might be identifiable as cranes as these appear to be standing on a stone and are thus signifiers of Christ's atonement. The presence of ribbons around some of the birds' necks, and these being held by an individual putto, may well have had an iconographic significance.

Bird 1 [N1u, N3u, R5, R6, R7 & MC lower tier]. A large bird that occurs amongst the top tier frames in the upper register of these designs. None are now complete, with in all cases the head missing although this may have been like those shown in the N1-N4 lower series. The carver included much characterisation with this bird: the feet are multi-jointed, knobbly and with well-defined sharply pointed claws.[11] The legs are multi-faceted and scaly, this is carved in a different way on adjoining faces – presumably to increase definition and to give the ensemble that added touch of sophistication. The wings and tail feathers are extended out into the

[11] In N3u the bird on the left has its left claw gripped around what is either a ball-terminal or this is possibly a stone in which case this is a potential iconographic representation of Christ's atonement.

wider design that echoes and sympathises with the surrounding scrollwork, if occasionally also adding a sharp contrast. The front wing is extended, swept back and up, while the back wing is folded in manner that echoes the treatment of Fox's badge. It seems probable that this bird was horned like those below in the lower tier. A scroll extends from the bird's belly down to the ogee frame, while the tail feathers extend in a long inward curve down to the frame as well.

Bird 2 [N2u, N5u, N1-N4 lower]. Modified, smaller version of bid 1. The central body scroll is missing and the tail feathers sweep away from the bird, while the wings are folded and similarly sweep out to end in points. The treatment of the face echoes that of the dolphin; there is a heavy brow and some emphasis on the eye. The bird has a pair of pointy but quite small horns, there is no indication in the carving that these should be seen as ears. In the lower tier frames the back leg is extended outwards and the claw rests on a ball-like form, or do we identify this as a stone? In both tiers, this form of the bird has a long, pointed beak.

Bird 3 [medallion in N2u and S6u] Based on bird 1 and 2 forms but without any horns, this bird is shown in the typical vulning pose of the pelican taken from medieval iconography and which Bishop Fox used as his badge. In N2u the pelican is shown with a leaping fish that is similar to the dolphins depicted all around, in S6u the pelican is shown with foliage and possibly a flower, perhaps a water-lily.

Bird 4 [S2u, S3u and S5u]. A small and compact bird with a small head and a short, stubby beak. The wings are part lifted with the upper part of the wing partially furled or rolled in a manner that echoes the treatment of the putti. The tail feathers are 'lost' into the surrounding scrollwork. The legs are short and lack the definition of the birds shown in the north frieze. This bird has a ribbon around its neck that is held by the adjacent putto, this juxtaposition is further marked by the positioning of the bird's beak held wide open over the putto's wing-tip.

Bird 5 [S6u]. This bird only appears once and has a long, swan-like neck with a quite prominent beak. The bird is shown vulning and is also standing on a one leg which is set on a ball-terminal or a stone. Like bird 4, bird 5 seems also to be held captive by its putto as there is a ribbon-like section of scrollwork which is held by the putto and which depends from the bird. This bird may be a crane.

Bird 6 [R5] This only occurs once and this on a shield where it can certainly be identified as representing Fox's pelican. It is based on bird 1 and 2 but has no horns.

Apart from the pelican which has a distinct iconographic message of laying down one's life for others, thus self-sacrifice, and the more literal giving of blood (the pelican in piety is shown pecking its breast so that its young may feed and thereby have life) that is clearly symbolic of the Crucifixion as well as the Eucharist, the birds in the frieze are difficult to identify as having a Christian message. None can be readily seen as doves, some might perhaps be identifiable as peacocks – it was said that peacocks did not decay after death and therefore symbolised immortality and the Resurrection[12] – while others might be cranes which were symbolic of vigilance.[13] In the Gaillon work one of the seat backs shows a putto set between a pair of fantastic creatures which may be birds but, given that the wings of these creatures are carved to look 'scaly', these might be better interpreted as dragons. The dragon was the embodiment of evil, and was seen representing Satan, the best known example of this occurring in the legends associated with St George and the dragon but we may note also an association with Adam and Eve and thus with original sin.[14] Thus it may be that some of the St Cross creatures may represent the fragmentary remains of dragons rather than anything less conspicuous for its iconographical messaging.

Fantastic creatures

Four other animal forms appear in the frieze: these can be loosely identified as a cross between a bird and a dolphin (creature 1), a greyhound (creature 2), a sphinx (creature 3) and a lion (creature 4). It should nonetheless be recollected that given the

12 Webber 1927, 76-77, noted that peacocks could be shown drinking from a vase or urn, this symbolic of life and salvation through the Sacraments – this might explain the birds shown in the MC lower tiers where birds have their beaks in urns.

13 Taylor 2003, 187; a crane was generally shown standing on one leg with this on a stone as this was sufficiently uncomfortable for the bird to be unable to sleep; additionally, it held the other leg out in front of itself which, when it fell if the bird drowsed off, would wake the bird up.

14 On St George and the dragon, see Riches 2000.

spirit of fantasy that pervades the frieze, these creatures may have been intended to be representative of other animals entirely.

Creature 1 [N4u, N6u, fragment from MC composite not placed in an R frame] A beaked animal lying on its back. The general treatment, style and feel of this animal reflects that of the dolphins but the treatment of this animal seems to be sufficiently different to see this as a different animal, particularly in view of the very well defined, bird-like, beak.

Creature 2 [S1u and S4u] A dog-like creature with well-defined paws, haunches, heavily delineated ribs and a long, flowing tail that give this animal a somewhat gaunt appearance. The head resembles many of the dolphin heads. Three of the dogs have horn-like ears, and here ears may well be an appropriate identification; the dog on the left in S1u has a small section of scrollwork which is possibly a carving error rather than a design feature. This animal may represent Henry VII's greyhound badge. The dog does not appear in the Bible and carries no obvious Christian symbolism.

Creature 3 – Sphinx [R1, R2 and R12] No complete examples of this motif have survived with all the heads missing and the three specimens from the MC composite are all slightly different. The treatment of the hind-quarters of this animal is similar to that of the dog described above. This creature is very similar to the sphinx motifs that appear in the Gaillon work.

Creature 4- lion [R9] Both of these are incomplete with the head missing from both and much of the body in one. The 'shaggy' nature of the head area and the back of these creatures seems to suggest a lion was intended here but note the cloven feet which might indicate this was a unicorn.[15] These are ridden by trumpet-blowing putti. As is normal in this style of work, extremities of the animal are developed into scrollwork and ball-terminals which link the animal into the surrounding work or which provide a hold for the putto.

15 This creature could be a unicorn. Friar 1996, 42, says that 'the medieval unicorn was a beautiful and elegant animal, like a horse but with cloven feet, a lion's tail, a goat's beard and a delicate spiralling horn on its forehead. It became a symbol of Christ because of its purity and virtue.'

Putti

The putti form the last of the major groups of individual motifs in this frieze and, like most of the other motifs seen here, were taken from classical sources. In the normal way, putti are generally shown as youthful, playful, impudent and mischievous boys – they are always boys although the fact of their sexuality is generally not a consideration. By contrast, in the St Cross frieze many of the putti are lumpen, elderly and joyless; additionally, in no one instance is there any sign of their sexuality as their genitalia are obscured or simply absent. Old-faced putti, although 'angels' may be a closer description, also occur in the great east window in Winchester cathedral. This was created and installed for Bishop Fox sometime between 1505 and 1515, with the glass perhaps painted by Bernard Flower. The presence of these 'old' putti may have been a deliberate design choice given the intended location of the frieze although this does not seem to have deterred Torrigiano whose putti adorning the tomb of Henry VII and Elizabeth conform to the norm. The many putti amongst the *all'antica* screens at Fécamp abbey are modestly displayed; the majority are either draped so as to hide their sex or turned so that a leg hides their body. Putti do not feature heavily in the Gaillon stallwork and here, most unusually, two female putti can be seen in one of the seat backs. Also, amongst the misericords at Gaillon is one featuring a group of putti with garlands and these are fully shown as unabashedly little boys. All the putti at Fécamp and Gaillon are youthful; there are no old-faced putti. At St Cross there are five distinct forms of putti.

Putto 1 [S1-S6 upper tier, top register] (figs 83-88). The putti shown astride dolphins and dogs across the top register of the upper frames of the south frieze are all old-faced putti with flaccid, lumped bodies and dour expressions on their faces. They mostly have long, straggly hair with only a suggestion of any curl. There is some variation in the manner in which each is depicted: individual faces differ, wings are organised slightly differently, and the putti on the dogs are shown straddling the animal while those on the dolphins are sitting in a side-saddle manner. Sadly, of the 20 putti remaining in the south frieze half are now faceless and many of these, seven, being putti in the lower part of the upper tier where it is

possible that 'young' putti predominated while 'old' putti occupied the top register, see for example frame S6 (fig 88). This may be a result of the method of constructing the work rather than being the result of iconoclasts or of vandalism. In order to give sufficient depth of wood to create these carvings, additional blocks of wood were attached to the close-set planks which form each frame, thus enabling the carvers to give a greater depth of feel to the carved work and add some emphasis of a three-dimensional effect. All of the capitals seem to have been treated in this way. It is hard to understand why so many have vanished unless they fell off and were smashed or were stolen by souvenir hunters.

Putto 2 [S2u, S3u, S5u and S6u, lower register and R3] (figs 84, 85, 87 and 88). The putti in the lower section of the upper frames occupy a triangle that fills the bottom corners of each of these frames. Only the putto in the bottom left corner of S6 retains its face. Putto 2 was a youthful putto and this seems to be reflected in the treatment of their bodies which seem also to be youthful. Although the putti are shown full face and completed naked, there is no trace of any genitalia and in frame S6 there seems to be some attempt to provide a 'fig leaf' to cover the putto's nakedness.

Putto 3 [N1b-N4b and N6b] (figs 89-94). The putto rising from fronds is another classical motif taken from its original context straight into Renaissance work, although in this scheme the fronds are very stylised. Each of the north tier sequence is different one from the next: different faces, changes to the shape and character of the bodies and alterations to the waistband that marks the top of the fronds which, here, are shown as a series of leaves, this being a characteristic technique of the carving work here. These putti seem to be neither especially youthful nor happy but then they are not specifically old and dour either, they are indeed altogether really quite enigmatic – and this too perhaps should be taken as an intention on the part of the designers and carvers, that there was an intention to give a sense of the imponderable, of mystery and of tension. All of the putti are set between pairs of fantastic birds, the putto rests its hands lightly on the birds' backs though whether in restraint or otherwise is difficult to establish. Strikingly similar putti in the same poses, with fantastic birds, and the same design of skirt top appear in the Gaillon work.

Putto 4 [R9 astride lions] (fig 120). The putti shown here have been much damaged but appear to show a more cherubic version of the putto than is seen elsewhere in the St Cross frieze. They have tightly curled hair and seemingly plump, round faces with plump bodies. Both are shown blowing trumpets, the only occurrence of a musical instrument in the frieze. They may have been associated with Fox's episcopal arms but the fit of the pieces shown in R9 should be seem as tentative. A more logical combination of lions and heraldry would be as supporters of the royal arms.

Putto 5 [MC1-4b] (figs 105-107). Putto head with wings set on top of an urn. A young face and with a different hairstyle to that seen elsewhere.

Other work

Amongst the dolphins, birds and putti are masks, cornucopia and urns. The masks are confined to the lower tier in the north frieze and are displayed in profile (figs 89-94). They are deeply carved and although the face is based on the same leafy technique employed with the dolphins, the masks exude a tolerant, slightly puzzled and almost dignified air which is as well for they are being 'pecked' by the birds that stand beside them – these being barely restrained by the centrally placed putto. The masks emerge from the cornucopia that form the base scrollwork of the north tier lower frames. In the Morning Chapel composite cornucopia are used in the same manner, but here supporting birds and urns (figs 105-107). The cornucopia have leaves draped around the neck while the mouth has an asymmetrical feel with the inner side more 'lippy' than the outer – this is also a feature of French work, the body of the cornucopia have a distinct texture that may have been an attempt to convey that these were horn. The mouth is carved with a decorative form that echoes the treatment of the urns (fig 125).

The urn was yet another motif taken from classical sources and freely used in Renaissance work. We are again confronted here with the problem of deciding if these were simply re-used classical motifs, or whether there was an intended and deliberate Christian iconographical message. A further problem is that the urns are filled with leafy-forms which may otherwise be interpreted as flames. The urn can of

course be seen as the Eucharistic chalice, but with the addition of flames this takes on another Christian identity. Flames can be seen as light, this equates with 'the light of the world' and thus Christ; flames are also closely associated with speaking in tongues and with Pentecost. There is further the thought that the urn could contain water and therefore we have a combination of fire and water which, as Visser put it can be understood as 'Christ entering the waters of the Jordan at his baptism, the fiery Spirit "making the waters fruitful" '.[16] Urns were extensively used in the Gaillon stallwork where they were carved on the canopy, where they were shown supported by dolphins, set in an alternate sequence of large and smaller urns. The same design idea and alternate sequencing was employed at St Cross, while the idea of paired dolphins with an urn within a single entire panel was used in Silkstede's frieze, at Sutton Place as a repetitive stringcourse detail and in the terracotta work of the East Anglian tombs. At St Cross there are two types of urn executed in five forms giving two tall and three squat urn examples. These are distributed so that four are in the south frieze lower tier and the fifth is in the MC lower tier.

Urn 1 [S1b] (fig 125). Tall urn with a well-defined, lobed body, slashed neck and a beaded rim. The rim has a row of alternate long and short beads, a scheme taken from the standard classical repertoire of decorative motifs.

Urn 2 [S3b] Variation of urn 1, here all the beads are short and the urn has a stand.

Urn 3 [S2b] Squat urn, long beads around the rim, six slashes on the neck and very lobed body.

Urn 4 [S4b] Variation of urn 3, three slashes to neck and only ahint of a stand.

Urn 5 [MC1b] Second variation of urn 3, smaller beads around rim, and ovoid slashes to neck. Here the flames or leaves of the above urns are replaced with a winged putto head.

Floral Motifs

16 Visser 2000, 135.

Taken *en masse* the floral motifs account for a substantial proportion of this frieze, whether they be seen as varying elements of the scrollwork most of which is vegetative in appearance or whimsically combined together to form other shapes such as the use of leaves for the stands of urns, as flames emerging form the urns, as the fronds that putti emerge from or the treatment of masks and depending from the mouths of the cornucopia. Added to these we can see that many of the pilaster motifs are floral or vegetative in appearance if mainly in the form of berries, fruits and leaves instead of flowers. One particular flower head can be seen in the top frames of the north frieze where it was set at the break of the angle in the ogee arches (figs 77-82). This is a bell-shaped flower like the blue-bell or tulip but given the over-characterisation and treatment (we may note yet again the use of the leaf type to create the body and shape of the flower) it is not possible to identify what flower was intended here.

A particular motif amongst the floral motifs is one form of a leaf. This has a single, central point with two sub-points that are separated from the centre point by deeply cut denticulations. The leaf is certainly not intended to reflect a real, natural counter-part but was an invention that, with slight variations, occurs regularly in this frieze and also in work at both Gaillon and Rouen. As has already been noted above, the leaf-form was used to build up other motifs and in particular the dolphins were created from a series of leaf types layered together in a stack. Leafy forms were also used to cover the scrollwork and add further dimension and complexity to the overall feel of the work. This reliance on the leaf-form has tended to give the St Cross frieze a somewhat heavy feel, although curvaceous it is not entirely graceful and lacks something of the curvilinear gracefulness and exuberance of the French work.

Pilaster motifs

The pilaster motifs are somewhat overshadowed by the larger motifs in the main frames of the frieze; they are much smaller and, because of their organisational arrangement down candelabra, perhaps are less attractive than their main-frame counter-parts. However, the same fascination for taking a shape and repeating it and changing it by subtle alteration that we have seen in the main frames is carried across and extended in the pilasters. The greater part of the pilaster motifs comprise floral motifs along with ribbons, tassels, beads and arms. Some fifty-five individual motifs can be identified (figs 110-112).

The pilaster motifs were set down candelabra one above the next with the candelabra itself prominently shown. The pilasters are carved in relief with the candelabra set within rectangular boxes that are edges and defined by a beaded rim – the frame containing the candelabra stands proud of the post, as do the capitals above, giving these a certain three-dimensional quality.

Each candelabrum hangs from a hook, nail or a staple set at the top of the pilaster and there are fourteen different hangers amongst the nineteen posts (in the MC series there is no lower pilaster post). The majority of hanging devices are hooks that are hooked over a staple or line which also differ slightly one from the next. None of the candelabra are tied or knotted to the top of the pilasters as in some of the French examples such as at Gaillon or Fécamp. The motifs set on each candelabra do not appear to conform to any pattern or a wider design, but are organised haphazardly and scattered across the frieze with no two posts quite alike although many are very similar in look. This fluidity of design enables the observer's eye to scan over the frieze without being greatly distracted by individual motifs and yet being aware of a general synchronicity and symmetry of design. This means it is difficult to discern conspicuous elements which was perhaps entirely the point – these were decorative backdrops and frames to what the designer and carver really wanted the observer to look at, namely the medallions and secondly the corbel figurines. The pilasters were then to be seen like the decorative margins of a title-page, fascinating but not of great moment and not intended to divert attention for over long.

Many of the individual motifs were worked together with other motifs to provide a more complex arrangement. Thus a bead, ribbon and shield were combined in pilaster design 2, while design 14 brought together a berry or bead, a bunch of three leaves suspended together with a tassel beneath. Many of the individual forms can be seen in pilaster work on terracotta from Hampton Court, Sutton Place and Layer Marney quite apart from being widely represented in France.

Floral motifs: 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 18, 20, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 42, 46, 47, 49, 51, 54, and 55 (total 25). Most of these are pointy-leaf motifs rendered in various styles; many are combined with other floral elements such as fruits (3), bead (8) and ribbon (28). The two main leaf types are single-point (the leaf is also somewhat bulbous) as in 1 and three-point, denticulated as in 8. A rounder leaf as in 19, 27, 40 and 47 offers an honesty type leaf but this may simply just be a disc. The forms suspended below 3, 10 and 26 may be berries or fruits but cannot be positively identified.

Bead motifs: 2, 4, 5, 16, 19, 21, 29, 35, 37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, and 55 (total 19). Used as a bead alone, or combined in groups of two, three or four, or in conjunction with other motifs such as a leaf group (8), with a ribbon (16) or a tassel (19), the bead seems to have been a useful motif that could be set alone or in combination. While it is possible to see a potential religious significance – such as a scourge – it is more likely that the motif was simply a useful decorative item.

Ribbon motifs: 2, 4, 5, 11, 13, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 29, 33, 39 and 44 (total 14). Ribbons were an integral element of classical ornament, although more usually associated with putti. Here the ribbon is of simple form and was integrated with other motifs as well as being set alone. Some of the ribbons are shown with a plain surface while other have a textured surface, some show a complex system of knotting while others are plain and uncomplicated.

Tassel motifs: 4, 12, 15, 27, 34, 40, 41, 43, 50 and 52 (total 10). Essentially the tassels really fall into only one of two main types with some variations that give changes which re-define each tassel as a different type. This change was achieved by varying the style of the tassel and by adding different sorts of ball heads to the top of the tassel.

Arms motifs: 2, 6, 9, 33, 39, 45 and 54 (total 7). Three motifs are trophies (6, 9 and 39), two are shields (2 and 33) and two are bows (45 and 54), together providing a surprisingly limited range of weaponry and trophies. All the weapons appear to be based on contemporary models if somewhat 'classicised'.

Onward transmission

As will become apparent, there is very little onward transmission from the St Cross frieze into derivative works. Medallions never again appeared set within a wider scheme of decorative work like this frieze although medallions alone did appear in other schemes such as within Silkstede's frieze and in the chapel frieze at Thruxton,[17] and were of course an important element of Wolsey's terracotta work at Hampton Court. The fantastic creatures, especially the dolphin, that are such an integral element of this frieze only partially appear in Silkstede's frieze but are otherwise almost completely absent from work in Hampshire, but had a minor role in terracotta work as at Sutton Place and in East Anglia. The use of minor motifs on candelabra set on pilasters similarly had limited use; they appear on terracotta frames used in fenestration at Hampton Court and Sutton Place, and in the panels of the East Anglian tombs. So that while the frieze itself was apparently never copied in its entirety (and we have to acknowledge that many a church has 'lost' its medieval fittings quite apart from the works that were destroyed when the monasteries were dissolved) subsequent work in southern England utilised elements from the St Cross frieze in the same way that St Cross itself drew selectively, but more comprehensively, from the work at Gaillon.

[17] Silkstede's frieze is described in Chapter 10, while the chapel frieze at Thruxton is detailed in Chapter 14.

Chapter 8:

St Cross frieze – the Sibyls

THE APPEARANCE OF A GROUP of sibyls in an English setting is sufficiently rare to justify a wider treatment of this aspect of the frieze. Additionally, the presence of sibyls at St Cross parallels their presence in the Gaillon frieze. This chapter examines the sources for these figures, explores the sibyls at St Cross in some detail and sets the sibyls at St Cross in the wider context of English work.

Sibyls – background and identification

In classical Greece and Rome, sibyls were women who were believed to be oracles or prophetesses, women of indeterminate age who could foretell the future. One such was the Cumaean sibyl who guided Aeneas through the underworld, and who gained universal fame through Virgil's *Aeneid*, another was the sibyl who spoke as the Delphic oracle. It was mainly through the research of Emile Mâle,[1] the renowned French art historian, that we have a general understanding of how sibyls came to be woven into late medieval art but his work did not include any exploration of their occurrence in England. He showed that sibyls appeared in Italian and French art from sometime in the thirteenth century, and that by the fourteenth century sibyls were becoming relatively common.[2] However, as Mâle observed, all of these instances appear to have been of single or small groups of sybils. In a process that

1 Mâle 1949, first published in 1908.
2 *Ibid.*, 255-57.

remains uncertain and uncharted, the fascination for including sybils in religious art – and we should note that these figures do seem only to have occurred in secular settings – was formalised sometime in the mid-fourteenth century.

The interest in placing sibyls within religious art may have been their inclusion, together with prophets, in mystery plays where sibyls had an important role in prophesying the Annunciation and His passion and crucifixion. These plays were formalised in the fourteenth century with the production of written texts. To these were later added engravings of individual sibyls and prophets. An important and popular set of such prints was a series produced by Baccio Baldini *c.*1470-80,[3] and these were widely available across Europe (fig. 126). A second and similarly popular production was that of a Dominican monk, Fra Filippo Barbieri whose *Discordantiae nonullae inter sanctae Hieronymum et Augustinum* included coloured woodcut illustrations of sibyls alongside a written description complete with their sayings and relevance within Christianity (fig. 127).[4] Konrad Oberhuber noted that while the woodcuts in Barbieri's book were different in appearance to Baldini's engravings, the inscriptions and attributes associated with each was largely the same.[5] Oberhuber went on to observe that a little known German historian, Lothar Freund, had discovered the source for Barbieri's writing,

> 'Barbieri's series of twelve sibyls was apparently based on the description of a lost cycle of frescoes executed around 1425 for the entrance hall of the Roman palace of the humanist and Cardinal Giordano Orsini.'[6]

The palace disappeared sometime after the sixteenth century, but a number of manuscript descriptions were written describing the Orsini cycle in addition to Barbieri's book and these also seem to have become quite widespread across Europe.[7]

The underlying rationale behind Orsini's arrangement of sibyls and prophets, and the formalisation of their sayings and attributes, appears to have been a combination of a humanistic desire by Renaissance Platonists to link Antiquity to

3 Many of these are illustrated in Levenson *et al*, 1973, 22-38.
4 Anderson 1995, 132-33 ; and see also www.humanisttheology.htm
5 Oberhuber in Levenson *et al*, 1973, 22.
6 *Ibid.*, 25. Freund's thesis was written in 1936 but never otherwise published.
7 *Ibid.* and see Mâle, *op.cit.*

Christianity,[8] alongside a straightforward medieval tendency to evoke the ideas and message of Christianity through analogy. Barbieri's book was not therefore necessarily original for its inclusion and description of sibyls but it, and Baccio Baldini's prints, seem to have sparked off a wider production of sibyls in religious works of art so that by the turn of the century full series of sibyls were becoming more frequently executed. The best known are of course those depicted by Michelangelo in his Sistine Chapel paintings of 1508-12,[9] he included five sibyls and seven prophets, but before his work was completed other artists had included sibyls in their work These include a series of sibyls with answering prophets that were carved for the choir stalls at Ulm by Georges Syrlin in 1469-74.,[10] and a little later, Ghiberti's Baptistry door at Florence; Ghirlandaio's paintings of 1485 in Sta Trinità, Florence, and Pinturicchio's paintings for Sixtus IV in 1493 in the Vatican and his paintings of 1501 at Sta Maria Maggiore at Spello. Lippi's fresco in the Carafa Chapel of Sta Maria sopra Minerva also included representation of sibyls.[11] Raphael contributed a series of sibyls and prophets, in a fresco painted in 1514, in Sta Maria della Pace in Rome.

In late medieval art there were variously depicted nine, ten or twelve sibyls; all three numberings having theological as well as magical significance and which may in part explain why particular numbers were selected in any one scheme. Their essentially pagan nature was linked through their prophecies to the coming of Christ and each was given an attribute or symbol that relate to their prophecies, many of them reflective of the symbols of the Passion. Sibyls were generally depicted as youthful but, as in Michelangelo's work in the Sistine chapel, occasionally they were depicted as ancient hags. Mâle noted that apart from Hellespontica who was fifty, the majority were apparently in their teens or under twenty five.

8 Charles Croslegh, explained this more simply, 'It seems that the wise and the good of the early Christian church thought that among the heathen of the nations of Antiquity there had been some few raised up to be prophets of the future Church of Christ. These 'prophetesses' were especially appointed to foretell the great mysteries of the Christian Faith. ... that the better and nobler spirits of the great nations of antiquity had a part in the preparation of the world for the reception of the faith of Christ.' Croslegh 1912, 9.

9 Rossi 1992.

10 Mâle 1949, 256.

11 Levenson *et al*, 1973, 22.

Sibyl	Attribute	Saying
Persian	lantern	Foretold birth of Christ
Libyca/Libyan	Lighted torch or candle, or a rose	Foretold Christ would be a Light to enlighten the Gentiles
Delphic	Horn, or crown of thorns	Foretold that Christ would be crowned with thorns
Cimmerian	Cornucopia	Prophesie that Christ would be nursed by the Virgin Mary
Erythraea	Rose or lily	Prophesied the Annunciation
Samian	Cradle	Foretold that Christ would be born of a Virgin
Cumana	Sponge on a reed, or bowl	Foretold the Nativity in a stable
Hellespontica	Tau cross, nails	Foretold the Crucifixion
Phrygian	Cross with banner	Proclaimed the Resurrection
European	Sword	Foretold the massacre of the innocents
Tiburtine	Hand, rod, or pillar	Foretold mocking and scourging of Christ
Aggrippa	Scourge or whip	Foretold scourging of Christ

Table 6: Sibyls, attributes and their sayings.[12]

Sibyls appeared in French art from the late thirteenth century, but only in their ones and twos. Complete groups of sibyls were apparently not created until at least the late fifteenth century; however it has to be said that dating for French work is difficult to establish because many of these works do not have a date inscribed upon them. An incomplete series of sibyls and prophets were included on the

12 This list is based on that given in Croslegh 1912, Drake and Drake 1916, and Tasker 1993, see also Mâle 1949, 267-72 where each sibyl is individually described.

cathedral doors at Beauvais (after 1515),[13] with full series of both in the glass in the churches of St Ouen, and incomplete groups in St Vincent (now mainly destroyed) and the cathedral in Rouen, and in chapel screens at Evreux.[14]

Sibyls were also an important element of the decorative work at Gaillon. The most significant depiction of sibyls at Gaillon was of those that appear in the choir stalls, but sibyls also featured in the carved stonework of the chapel tower and in stone carvings displayed elsewhere (their original location is now not known because of the damage inflicted on the château during the French Revolution) in the building complex (fig. 128).[15] Amongst the work of choir stalls there is a sequence of twelve marquetry panels, termed by Elaine Liou the G3 panels (fig. 16), which are set as a lower tier of panels in the stall backs (fig. 15).[16] Five represent sibyls: Hellespontica (N1), an unidentified sibyl but probably Erythrea (N2), the Delphic sibyl (N6), the Persian sibyl (S2) and the Tiburtine sibyl (S5); the remainder represent seven of the Virtues.[17] Virtues also appeared in a series set across the foot of the d'Amboise tomb in Rouen cathedral (fig. 35).

The Gaillon sibyls are all depicted full length and seated on ornate chairs, or perhaps these might be identifiable as thrones, set within richly decorated settings (figs 129 and 130). Each has a banner on which an inscription can read that identifies the sibyl (the virtues also have banners that identify them). Additionally, each sibyl has its particular attribute, thus the Hellespontica has her tau cross, and the Persian her lantern. The sibyls are dressed in what appears to be contemporary, if sumptuous, costume which is in contrast to the costumes worn by the sibyls depicted by Baldini (fig. 126). Given the level of classical detail to be seen around the sibyls and virtues, much of which echoes the ideas but not the designs of work in the remainder of the choir stall panels, a separate set of designs would have to have

13 Pers. obs. and see Forstel and Magnien 1998, 6. The carvings of the doors include the salamander badge of Francis I which necessarily dates them to after 1515. There are also sibyls in the window glass at Beauvais, but this dates to 1537.

14 All pers. obs.

15 Two of the stone carved sibyls that were removed from the chateau during the French Revolution have been returned to Gaillon from the Ecole des Beaux Arts, Paris; they are illustrated in Buckard and Chirol 1980, 56-57.

16 Liou 1997, Appendix F, pp. 297-303 and see figure on p. 298.

17 N3 – Justice, N4 – Hope, N5 – Prudence, S1 – Faith, S3 – Fortitude, S5 – Temperance, and S6 – Charity.

been made for these panels. However, the Gaillon sibyls clearly did not depend solely upon the Baldini prints for their design, although the prints themselves may have supplied the general idea of the sibyls. A *Book of Hours* by Louis Laval, created later in the fifteenth century, shows a series of sibyls seated on ornate thrones with chequer-board floors and Gothic-styled pinnacled posts either side that framed small figurines (fig. 127); thus it may be that it was this book that underlay the general design theme of the Gaillon sibyl and virtue panels.[18] The sibyls in the windows at St Ouen in Rouen and in the cathedral at Beauvais stand full length and have also long banners that include keynote phrases associated with the sayings of each sibyl, but are otherwise depicted on neutral or plain backgrounds. It may be noted that although only five sibyls are today present in the Gaillon stalls, this may not be a reflection of the original as it is reasonably certain that the lateral range has been lost, and in this range there may well have featured the other four (or five or six) sibyls.

I noted earlier that sibyls were often associated in fifteenth and sixteenth century contexts with a matching series of prophets. In between each of the G2 marquetry panels is a post, numerated as G3 and G3[1] by Elaine Liou (fig. 16), and contained in the central niches of these posts, two to each post with one set above the other, are figurines carved in the round in wood. Instead of prophets, the programme at Gaillon has a series that includes both the apostles and other saints.

Sibyls and prophets at St Cross – survival and distribution

At St Cross there is a double series of nine figurines, one of sibyls and the other that arguably represents a series of prophets, providing eighteen figurines in all. The corbel figurines were suspended from the base of the frieze posts and each conforms to a general common design (fig. 131). As mentioned above, these figurines were seen and recorded by John Carter in 1788 and his drawings and notes provide an invaluable source demonstrating as to where these figurines were originally placed. It seems highly probable that when Carter drew the figurines the stallwork in the chancel was still relatively intact, which suggests that there never were more than the eighteen he depicted (fig. 5). As I have also shown above, it became clear during

18 Illustrated in Mâle 1949, 267-69, figs 134-136.

the process of the Smith and Riall survey of the stalls that they had been switched around inside the chancel; so that the stall now on the north side is in fact the original south side stall. Thus, seven of the figurines, numbered by Carter as 10 – 16, now hang in sequence from the posts of the north frieze but these were originally those that hung over the south side canopied stall. This confirms for us two things: first, that all seven posts above the canopied stalls had corbel figurines, leaving two to be displayed above the lateral range; secondly, that while the original sequence has been preserved in what is now the north frieze (therefore the original south frieze), that in the south has been much disrupted. Table 7 shows the disposition of the corbel figurines with the diamond symbols showing which of the figurines still remains today in its 1790 situation. The disruption to the present south frieze, in terms of the disarrangement of the corbel figurines, is quite surprising when it is considered that the openwork carving in the frieze itself appears to be largely intact.[19]

North			South			M 'Chapel	
now	1790		now	1790		now	1790
1	10	♦	8 (1)	2		15 (1)	1
2	11	♦	9 (2)	5		16 (2)	4
3	12	♦	10 (3)	3		17 (3)	17
4	13	♦	11 (4)	6	♦	18 (4)	18
5	14	♦	12 (5)	7	♦		
6	15	♦	13 (6)	8	♦		
7	16	♦	14 (7)	9	♦		

Table 7: St Cross. Distribution of corbel figurines (and see fig. 5). The diamond symbols show those figurines that are still hanging from their original posts. Three of the Morning Chapel posts are probably complete in the sense that they retain their corbel figurines in the correct sequence.

[19] It is possible the figurines were detached from the frieze when it was dismantled and, possibly not being properly labelled, were later re-attached in the wrong order.

A further consequence of establishing that Carter's drawings faithfully represented an original sequence is that we can see the original arrangement of the corbel figurines was somewhat erratic. Or is it? The Carter sequence of figurines 10 through to 18 shows an alternating display of sibyl – prophet – sibyl etc. This is now the N1 – N7 and MC3 – MC4 sequence, or what was the original south frieze layout (fig. 2) Carter's sequence of corbel figurine 1 – 9 shows a disrupted series and we might question just how accurately this reflected the original sequence. However, as four of these are still hanging in their Carter sequence (S4 – S7, Carter's 6-9) it may just be that the original sequence on the north frieze did not parallel the alternating arrangement seen in the original south frieze. Even so, this remains surprising in view of the strong sense of symmetry that obtains throughout the frieze.

The sibyls and prophets – style and identification

All of the St Cross corbel figurines carry banners or scrolls which would once have been lettered and thereby have identified each, either by a direct reference as to who they were, as at Gaillon (figs 129 and 130), or through the quotation of a well-known key phrase that was associated with each. All the labels have long since lost their lettering, which means that almost all the prophets cannot now be identified with any certainty although we can hazard some ideas by reference to their association with their counterpart sibyls. That said, the banners are quite small and it may be that these simply carried an identification of the sibyl or prophet, in the manner as shown at Gaillon, rather than a quotation. Many of the St Cross sibyls can however be identified through the attributes that each holds or carries; that said, some are so damaged that their attribute has been completely lost.

The table which follows describes each sibyl and prophet briefly and, where this is possible, offers a possible identification based on their attributes. Each is illustrated with the relevant lower tier frame in figures 89 – 100 (chancel sections) and figures 105 – 107 (Morning Chapel sections). The figure given in square brackets, eg [1], indicates Carter's original numbering.

N1 [10] Young sibyl with her left arm held against the remnant of her scroll.

N2 [11] Elderly bearded prophet with cloth headdress.

N3 [12] Young sibyl with open book on her lap, but no obvious scroll.

N4 [13] Bearded prophet pointing to a scroll held rolled up in his left hand.

N5 [14] Turbanned sibyl with cross in her left hand and a scroll. The Phygrian sibyl is depicted with a cross and, usually, a banner; she was thought to have foretold the Resurrection.

N6 [15] Prophet wearing a crown and holding three unidentified objects in his right hand and with a scroll.

N7 [16] Slightly damaged figure of a sibyl. With her lantern, this figure can be interpreted as the Persian sibyl, the lamp epitomising the overpowering of evil and the coming of the Saviour.

S1 [2] Bearded prophet with scroll.

S2 [5] Youthful sibyl with a distinctive hat and holding a rod-like object in her right hand (see also fig 131), as does the sibyl in S4. The Cumaean held a reed with a sponge on one end and this seems to be what Carter attempted to depict and what is represented by the remaining wood, this is a direct reference to the Crucifixion. One of the panels in Fox's great east window in the cathedral also depicts this symbol, although here it is more clearly based on the Passion symbol of the hyssop with a sponge.

S3 [3] Bearded prophet with scroll, his denticulated hat suggests a crown.

S4 [6] A second sibyl holding a rod-like object in her right hand. This is probably to be identified as the Erithraean sibyl who held a rose on along stalk, or a lily, that was symbolic of the Annunciation. The European sibyl held a sword but this does not seem to be what is depicted here.

S5 [7] A second bearded prophet similar to S3.

S6 [8] Prophet wearing a turban – figure somewhat damaged.

S7 [9] Youthful prophet wearing a crown and holding a scroll.

MC1 [1] Heavily turbaned figure of a sibyl with a scroll and with the pillar at which Christ was scourged; this is associated with the Sibyl Tiburtine

MC2 [4] Sibyl holding a tau cross in her right hand and with her left hand held up with the index finger pointing upwards; this can be identified as the Hellespontine sibyl (compare this with the sibyl in Gaillon stall N1, fig. 20).

MC3 [17] Prophet with scroll.

MC4 [18] Sibyl with neither an attribute nor a scroll. The position of the hands held apart is indicative of the Samian sibyl who held a cradle; she foretold the nativity.

Table 8: Description of the sibyls and prophets in the St Cross frieze.

This leaves two that are so damaged that they cannot be clearly identified. One is probably the Delphic sibyl as this sibyl is said to have foretold that Our Lord would be born of a virgin. Bishop Fox had a particular veneration for the Passion of the Christ, the symbols appeared on a frieze of shields held by angels above the altar in his chantry chapel (fig. 51) and amongst the bosses in both the presbytery aisle and presbytery vaults in the cathedral, thus this sibyl would closely identify with that interest. A second sibyl that is also closely associated with the Passion is the Agrippan sibyl which held a scourge and foretold the scourging of Our Lord. Scourges featured strongly amongst the symbols of the Passion that Fox caused to be placed amongst his work in the cathedral.

Mâle quoted a section of Filippo Barbieri's book to show the associations that had been made between sibyls and prophets in the scheme at Cardinal Orsini's palace.[20] While there does seem to have been some adherence in French series to Barbieri's prescriptive, other series also appeared which were more complex and, as we have seen in the case of Gaillon, prophets were replaced with apostles and saints. In the case of the sibyls at St Cross, the style and general character of the male figures seems to be more appropriate for prophets than for apostles, we may note that apart from the crowned figure of N6 holding three objects under his right arm, none of the male figurines carries or carried any sort of attribute, thus N6 might in fact be holding three scrolls. Further, there was no attempt here to give these figures any sense of the style we would expect with depictions of apostles: thus, no other

20 Mâle 1949, 259-61.

features such as crosses or books that might be definitively described as a Bible. I think we can be reasonably certain that these were fully intended to be prophets, and we may note that Bishop included prophets in his window glass in Winchester cathedral. The table which follows gives a listing of those prophets that were often associated with a sibyl. As there is much divergence of opinion as to who should be associated with whom, I have added a second list of prophets to that provided by Mâle, this one drawn from Maurice and Wilfred Drake's *Saints and their Emblems* of 1882, which suggests a second series based on direct art historical observations of sibyls and prophets placed together.

Sibyl	**Mâle**	**Drake**
Persian sibyl	Hosea	Zachariah
Libyan sibyl	Jeremiah	Abdias
Delphic sibyl	Jeremiah	Hosea
Cimmerian sibyl	Joel	------
Erythrean sibyl	Ezekiel	Zachariah
Samian sibyl	David	Baruch
Cumaean sibyl	Daniel	Haggai
Hellespontine sibyl	Jonah	Isaiah
Phrygian sibyl	Malachi	Jeremiah
European sibyl	Zachariah	Amos
Tiburtine sibyl	Michaiah	Michaiah
Agrippan sibyl	------	Jeremiah

Table 11: Sibyls and prophets from Mâle (1949) and Drake (1882).

As may be seen, Jeremiah occurs in both lists twice, while Zachariah appears in the Drake's list twice. We are unable to identify who the prophets are, and because we cannot even be sure as to which way the associations should be read – to the left, or the right, or did they answer each other across the space of the chancel – this leaves

us in a quandary that probably cannot be satisfactorily answered beyond the general indications that I have laid out above.

Sibyls, prophets and the profile portraits in medallions

In the last chapter, I described the portrait profiles in medallions that are the focus of the main frames of the frieze. I suggested there that there was a possibility that the portraits represented Worthies. It is possible that the series of sibyls and prophets were designed to provide a counter-voice, so to speak, to these portraits but as it seems very unlikely that there can have been eighteen Worthies amongst the medallions this seems improbable. My own view is that the medallions represent the main figures from Virgil's *Aeneid*, which could, through the Cumean sibyl, be linked to the sibyl series. We should also ask if there should of necessity be any link between the two groups of figures. There is even a sense that the figurines could be seen as an afterthought, an addition to the original design, one that offered a fuller completion to the work and an opportunity to declare the Christian message. This also ties in with what we know of Bishop Fox's pre-occupations elsewhere, especially his interest in communicating the fundamental Christian message – the coming of the Lord and the Passion of the Christ.

Sibyls in English contexts

None of the other surviving schemes of art works with which Fox, or his close associates, can be connected reveals further displays of sibyls, either as a group or individually, and this further emphasises the connection between the work at Gaillon and the frieze at St Cross. We may however note that Instruments of the Passion feature importantly as a frieze above the altar in Fox's chantry chapel. Additionally, these symbols also occur on bosses amongst Fox's heraldry on both the main presbytery vault and on the presbytery aisles vaults as well as on shields on the north presbytery screens – all of these in the cathedral.[21] Of these, only the shields on the screens can really be seen as being later than the frieze at St Cross. It

21 These settings are described in Chapter 6.

could therefore be argued that in the St Cross context, the sibyls are no more than bearers of these symbols rather than having a more overt presence actually as sybils. This I think is unlikely as it is very probable that Fox would have been very aware of the significance of sybils and their potency for evoking the Christian message.

Several other series of paintings of sibyls (the St Cross series seems to be the only set of carved work) survive in England, with most of these on choir screens in Devon[22] – Bradninch,[23] Heavitree[24] and Ugborough where sibyls appear in frames that also included Renaissance detail (fig. 132).[25] However, all of these screens date probably to the later 1520s if not the 1530s. That sibyls may perhaps also have been common in window glass is suggested by their presence at Coughton Court, Warwickshire.[26] A further series of windows at Rendcomb church, Gloucestershire, provides a lovely setting of glass executed in a Renaissance style. In the upper lights of the east window are a series of six angels each bearing an attribute more usually associated with sibyls; we can be certain that these are angels as they are winged. [27] An alabaster carving in the museum at St Peter's Hunsgate, Norwich, which is usually identified as that of nine female saints could, on the basis of their attributes, very easily be interpreted as a group of sibyls but is as likely to be a grouping of female saints.

This limited survival should alert us to the possibility that many examples of sibylline groups could have been swept away by iconoclasts in the bouts of reformist zeal that took place later in the sixteenth and in the seventeenth centuries.

22 On sibyls, see Slader 1968, and Tasker 1993, 171-6.

23 On Bradninch, see Crosleigh 1912, 6-10; and see also Cherry and Pevsner 1999, 200-1; and pers. obs. The Bradninch series also included a number of saints: St Bridget, St Christopher, St Michael, St Aegidius (?), St Francis, St George, St Gabriel and St Sebastian.

24 On Heavitree, see Cherry and Pevsner 1999, 393 who mention the screen but not the sibyls.

25 On Ugborough, Tasker 1993, 171-6 and see Cherry and Pevsner 1999, 878-9; and pers. obs. At Ugborough there are twelve sibyls and these are alongside St Appolonia, another female saint, the Virgin Mary, Archangel Gabriel, Madonna and Child, Caspar, Melchior, Balthazar (?), St John the Baptist, St Edmund and two panels of archers, St Lucy, St Agatha, St John the Baptist's executioner holding St John's head and Salome.

26 Pers. obs.

27 Verey 1999, 377, suggests in his description of the church that these are sibyls.

Chapter 9:

St Cross frieze – the Gaillon connection and the problem of dating the St Cross frieze

IN EARLIER chapters of this work I described the stallwork at Gaillon and the frieze with canopied stalls at St Cross with, throughout these, a number of references to the design parallels that link the two sets of work. In this chapter I shall examine more closely some of those parallels in order to demonstrate the validity of these *comparanda*. As it highly unlikely that the St Cross work could be earlier than the Gaillon stalls, and having shown above why I consider that the Gaillon work was substantially created before 1510,[1] I have therefore taken the view that the Gaillon work is the primary setting upon which that at St Cross is based, the latter being dated to *c.*1515. In the description and discussion that follows I shall first outline some of the key individual design features that link the two works and then I shall draw some parallels that embrace the wider designs of entire panels.

1 The full documentary record for the construction of the Gaillon stalls is given in Appendix 1.

Carving techniques – relief carvings and openwork

I highlighted in previous chapters the important distinction between the Gaillon and St Cross work, insomuch as the former was carved in relief on solid planks whilst the latter was carved in open-work. I noted also that this had a negative effect upon the capacity of the carvers to achieve a fine line of cut in the tendrils and other effusive elements of the St Cross carving. Nonetheless, as I also noted, the Gaillon work was carved to a tremendously high standard, while the work at St Cross is of a lesser quality. We may note that in the Gaillonesque work the execution of line is very accomplished for its precision of accuracy, its symmetry and its fineness of curve (figs 19 and 20). Where tendrils escape from individual motifs, such as the plumes from dolphins, the curls of rinceaux or the work around flowers and leaves, the French carvers were able to aspire to very fine, whispy lines that the carvers of the St Cross frieze could not hope to achieve (figs 23 and 24).

The motifs and design interconnections between Gaillon and St Cross

As I noted above but can be repeated here, the Gaillon and St Cross works are covered in a range of motifs that are drawn from classical sources, modified through the prism of Renaissance artists and designers in Italy and France, and organised in settings worked by French craftsmen at Gaillon but of unknown nationality at St Cross. The St Cross frieze can be determined as one of a kind although this is not to say that there are not pieces that can be deemed to derivative, as may be seen in the work created for Prior Silkstede in Winchester Cathedral.[2] There is no other work on the same scale as St Cross, nothing that features a major group of medallions and figurines set within a single scheme of work.

While the point has already been addressed above it bears repetition and further illumination that the two sets of work were created for small chapels which can be closely associated with major ecclesiastical figures: Cardinal-Archbishop

2 On this work, see below Chapter 10.

Georges d'Amboise at Gaillon and Bishop Richard Fox at St Cross. Gaillon was the summer palace of the Rouen archbishopric which d'Amboise re-created in a Renaissance mode for himself although he rarely had the time or freedom to enjoy it before he died, whilst St Cross seems to have been partially appropriated as a 'retreat' by Fox. This has a bearing on the constituent parts of the works and how we should visualise them in the sense that there can be seen a choice on the part of the individual as to how these chapels were furnished and how the selection of *all'antica* motif-work was articulated to support their own particular Christian interests. In both of these contexts, the settings formed part of the furnishings for Christian chapels and doubtless the selection of designs and motifs used in these works was modified by this central consideration. So that, while there is a range of classical imagery and a profusion of motifs that seem to have no overt significance, there remains a strong probability that, especially in the case of the St Cross frieze, there is more than a hint of intentional Christian iconography. This point could be over-emphasised, as there is a case also to suggest that given the nature of *all'antica* work it was inevitable that a range of motifs would have to be used, and that many could carry Christian connotations but which were not originally intended to carry such messages.[3] In other words, the art form itself was capable of carrying messages that were not the original intent and we should therefore exercise some caution in being overly prescriptive in identifying Christian symbols where, in fact, there need not have been any. That said, in the context of St Cross, it can clearly be seen that there is a case to suggest that Fox actively chose symbolism that displayed a Christian message. Our problem now is to de-code, if we can, that message.

Horned creatures

As has already been stated above, of especial interest here are the horned creatures that so characterise the St Cross frieze, in particular the dolphins. At Gaillon these are clearly and deliberately carved to represent horns, complete with a well-defined spiral twist (figs 20 and 26). But at St Cross the horns are quite crude (see e.g.fig. 96)

[3] The problem of conveying classical ideas into Renaissance work is discussed by Bialostocki in Kitson and Shearman 1967, 69-74.

and have no trace of the Gaillonesque style, while in the Silkstede frieze (fig. 133) and Marney tomb, they are even cruder (fig. 134). Nonetheless, the horns which characterise the St Cross frieze are hardly seen elsewhere in England apart from the sites cited above, and offer the strongest link with the Gaillon frieze. It should also be noted again that such horned creatures are similarly very rare in French contexts which further emphasises the link to be seen between the sets of work.[4]

These horned motifs form the first and most obvious link connecting the two works. While horns attached to the fantastic creatures in the St Cross frieze can be said to be somewhat ear-like in their characteristics, it is clear from the Gaillon work that it was horns, not ears, that were intended. This is especially clear in one of the G7 type bottom boards and two of the G4 seat backs (figs 20, 26 and 28) where the spiral twist of the horns on these creatures is clearly delineated. Further examples can be seen on the G9 underside panels of the tipping seats where fantastic creatures either side of the misericords have similar horny protrusions. Horns are fitted, in the Gaillon work, to both dolphins and birds of which some are evidently based on mythical creatures such as the griffins in a G7 board (fig. 27). We may also note that not all the creatures have these horns. The G15 panels that fill the canopy above the stalls are characterised by a repetitive design that shows two designs for individual panels set in alternating sequence. Amongst these panels are two forms of dolphins: one an effusive and showy creature with splendidly curving plumes but no horns (figs 19 and 21) while the other is a less ostentatious creature but which does have horns (fig. 26). Both types of dolphin appear in the St Cross frieze.[5]

Further, we may note that the desks that stood in front of the Gaillon stalls are also filled with carved dolphins, both in the main panels and in a narrow frieze that fills the top rail across the desk fronts. None of these have horns, but the pilasters that separate these panels are filled with motifs and capped with capitals that were paralleled in the St Cross work. We should also remark upon the dolphins that feature in the Gaillon stall canopy (fig. 32). None of these have horns but the design idea is carried over in its entirety into the St Cross frieze (fig. 97). So that while these horned creatures are characteristic of both sets of work, and to some

4 Horned creatures only appear in work at Gaillon and Evreux and occasionally in Rouen, they are absent from the *all'antica* work at Fécamp; pers. obs.

5 See above, pp. 200-203

extent even define the work, they do not appear to have been a pre-requisite in the overall designs and they form – in the Gaillon work – only a small proportion of the numbers of motifs employed amongst the carvings. There are proportionally rather more in the St Cross work. The horns are significant as much because they are conspicuous as they are unusual rather than for any aesthetic quality they bring to the work. One could argue that amongst the St Cross carvings the horns seem almost crude and thus a detraction from the visible qualities of the work but, I suggest, this would be to miss the point which, I contend, is that the idea of the horns was carried across into the St Cross work regardless of what they brought either aesthetically or intellectually to the frieze. And on this point of intellectual content something also must be said. Why place these curious and obviously unnatural features on these animals?

The fact that in the Gaillon work all the horns have a spiral twist clearly indicates that it was, as I have said, a horn that was intended.[6] Attached to a dolphin-style animal, this could be an intentional reference to the narwhal which in this period was both a semi-mystical creature and endowed with magical qualities. The fantastic birds could have been treated in the same way in order to simplify the strength of the overall design – the idea of 'less is better' can be seen as an underpinning element to the overall designs of these panels. We may note that the peacock has plumage on its head that could be represented as horns, thus some at least of these birds could be peacocks which have their own particular Christian symbolism as a motif for the Resurrection. This however does not explain one of the G4 seatbacks where a scaly monster-like creature can be interpreted as a dragon or dragon-type creature, and this too has horns. We might then explain away the horns as simply a design idiosyncrasy, one the designer/s was attracted by and determined to use as frequently as possible wherever possible with no regard for providing an intellectual framework that explained why these attributes were added. The problem is compounded by the fact that such horned creatures are also rarely found amongst early sixteenth century *all'antica* work in France.

6 In a curious conceit, the G7 panel in the Gaillon north range, stall 1, shows a pair of wild looking putti that wear headdresses from which emerge quite fierce looking horns.

The presence of the horns amongst the fantastic creatures present in the Gaillon work provides one of the strongest links between the two sets of work, a link that is emphasised by the rarity of its occurrence in both French and English contexts.

Putti

The putti in the St Cross frieze have been described above and it remains to draw out here some of the design parallels between Gaillon and St Cross. Putti were not such a ubiquitous feature in the Gaillon work as they are in the St Cross frieze, forming at Gaillon a very low proportion of the work. Thus in the south frieze at St Cross they are omnipresent, whereas at Gaillon their presence is far more discreet in the stalls, although they are more frequent in the screens. The majority of the Gaillon putti amongst the relief carvings comprise winged putto heads or putti 'rising from fronds' instead of complete, full body figures similar to those seen in the St Cross work. We should however note that putti also occur amongst the marquetry work of the Gaillon stalls (the G2, G5, G6, G12 and G13 panels, see figs 15 and 16) but the detail is too small to allow a justifiable parallel to be drawn between the two pieces of work. One such, the seat of stall N6, shows two sets of putti interspersed with masks and with the putti holding a shield suspended from ribbons. Although very colourful because of the use of many types of wood, the depiction of the putti is in fact quite poor and imprecise(fig. 135); the putti carved in relief are much fuller in their detail and characterisation. This also serves to demonstrate the invalidity of comparing these putti with those carved in relief.

One of the Gaillon misericords features full-length putti and these conform to the normal style of youthful, pert figures that we often to see in work of this era (fig. 136). Attention can be drawn to two types of putti: a winged head that is set above an urn and used in the G15 canopy panels and a putto between a pair of fantastic birds to be seen in a G7 bottom-board panel.

The Gaillon winged putto heads are in the same general style as those to be seen in the St Cross work (fig. 32), especially in the lower tier frames of what was the lateral range but not to be seen in the Morning Chapel, although it has to be said that

the motif was widespread in *all'antica* work. This presence of this motif and its stylisation only becomes apparent because of other connections, such as the horned creatures, but once we see the possibility for the closeness of the parallels then more subtle comparisons, such as this putto, become clearer. This point is underlined by reference to another group of putti, those rising from fronds. That in a G7 board (fig. 27) is especially apposite. This putto wears a flamboyant headdress, this is missing in the St Cross exemplars, and has a form of grass-skirt, or fronds, suspended from a waistband or belt that follows a particular geometric, curvilinear shape.

Very similar putti appear in a G4 panel in stall 6 of the north range (fig. 20). This particular panel is especially interesting for the number of links it offers to the work at St Cross. The focal point is a medallion with a profile portrait of a woman facing (here) left.[7] This is the only medallion to feature in the Gaillon stallwork, although medallions featured in the cloiture (screen) work.[8] The woman portrayed here is very similar to that at St Cross in S3u (fig. 85). One aspect that is very striking is the same use of scrollwork that extends forwards from the woman's headdress and in front of her face. The St Cross S3u version is clearly a simplified copy of the Gaillon portrait, the settings are however quite different (figs 20 and 85). Running up the centre line of the panel is a design that interweaves a tall lobed urn set on a stand with, rising from its mouth, a winged putto. The pointy skirt band worn by this putto matches those of the putti seen in the St Cross north screen lower tier panels (figs 90-2, 94), a parallel that is emphasised by the echoing of motifs around the putto. In the Gaillon panel there are a pair of dragons, we may note the deliberately scaly wings of this creature and this is generally taken to denote a dragon or dragon type in the art work of the later middle ages. An echo of this arrangement can be seen in the St Cross S1u and S4u panels (figs 83 and 86) where putti have their hands thrust into the throats of the creature which the putti straddle, these animals probably representing dogs. On either side of the Gaillon G4 panel (fig. 20) are two

7 Like the St Cross stallwork, the Gaillon stalls have been subjected to many moves and alterations so that it is not now possible to be entirely certain of its original layout. Unlike the St Cross work where the corbel figurines were drawn prior to any substantial disruption of the stallwork, no drawings were made of the Gaillon work before it was dismantled.

8 Medallions also featured in the choir screen and included portraits of Louis XII, Cardinal d'Amboise, Hadrian and Faustina. These are now in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. On these pieces, see Rieder 1977, 351 and Liou 1997.

further putti. These are most unusual as both are clearly female, and this is the only such incidence of female putti in this work; there are none in an English context. The skirts worn by these putti are matched by those worn by the putti in the St Cross north screen N2b, N3b and N6b panels although all three of these are obviously male figures.

Fantastic birds

The range and characteristics of the fantastic birds in the St Cross frieze has been described above. Many of them reflect the general tone and style of the birds to be seen in the Gaillon work although, because of the quality of the two works, it is difficult to compare like-with-like. One of the G4 panels from the Gaillon north range and the St Cross north frieze lower tier panels offer a useful means of comparing the two works (fig. 137). The Gaillon panel shows a central block of work with an urn and a winged putto at the base, above this a plaque which provides a platform for a pair of cavorting addorsed dolphins whose tails merge together and twine upwards into a foliate column. The bottom half of the panel is filled with floral rinceaux that incorporate beads, cornucopia and flowers. Across the top is a more graphic design featuring a pair of slashed volutes that curve upwards and are transformed into heavily delineated masks. Standing on the volutes are a pair of birds, horned, with raised wings and open mouths that affront the masks. This layout is mirrored in the St Cross lower north frieze panels but here a we find a central putto (fig. 138). This arrangement of putto with his hands lying on a bird standing either side of him can be seen in a G7 panel of the Gaillon stallwork.

A noticeable feature of both sets of work is the treatment of the birds' legs. The work at St Cross has been remarked upon above where it was noted that this part of the bird was treated a very naturalistic manner. This same quality can be seen at Gaillon. All the birds are however largely unnatural and in no one case can we point to an individual specimen and connect it to a natural species.

Masks

The panel described above (fig. 22 and 137) shows two masks. This motif is again not particularly common in the Gaillon work, nor is it at St Cross, and is more often seen face-on, as opposed to in profile, as seen in this panel. While not exact copies, and perhaps we should ask the question whether we should expect that they ought to be precise copies, the masks at St Cross are very similar in pose and attitude to those at Gaillon. What is very interesting is the totality of the carry-over of design from Gaillon into the St Cross work. The mask at Gaillon is set as a terminal to a slashed volute, at St Cross we have the same volute with similar cladding of leafy material, with this emerging from a cornucopia. The combination of cornucopia and slashed volute can be seen in another G7 panel (fig. 27). Can we take from this the idea that having designed the Gaillon work, the designer/s for the St Cross frieze felt able and flexible enough to take individual designs, match and merge some of them and replicate similar motifs but organised in a different way? I believe that this is precisely what the designer/s of the St Cross frieze achieved.

Urns

As we have seen, these formed a strong element of the design of the St Cross work, where they featured in the lower tier frames. Many of the St Cross urns have leaves emerging from the mouths of these urns, and these I suggested above, might be interpreted as flames – these having a particular Christian significance. In the Gaillon work, we notice that the detailing of the urns is much finer and more emphatic, with a very much finer cut to the chiselling of the relief carving. This is a feature of the entire Gaillon work but one that here has a wider bearing on the urns. None of the urns depicted in the Gaillon work can be construed as having flames emerging from their mouths but rather they have a cornucopia-like assemblage of leaves and fruits, for example in a G7 panel (fig. 26). This panel shows a pair of horned creatures that I have remarked upon earlier, these have further scrollwork that curls away behind them and which finishes with a central flower. This flower has a distinctly geometric feel to it, offering a five-sided design that is very

reminiscent of the Tudor rose. Clearly in this context this is not a Tudor rose and leads us to look again at some of the floral devices to be seen in the St Cross and Silkstede friezes. Can we really justify calling these Tudor roses when there is the possibility of a parallel to a Gaillon original? I suspect that given the context of the English friezes that a Tudor rose was probably what was intended. The centralised urn, more a platter perhaps than urn, is clearly shown with three fruits backed with a bunch of leaves.

In some cases also it is clear that the urns have lids or caps and that these have a foliate style handle or top (fig. 28). The problem then becomes one of re-use in a different context with, perhaps, a redirection of emphasis so that the St Cross work was given a deliberate and intentionally symbolic, Christian, identity. If we examine the urns in the Gaillon canopy panels (figs 30 and 31) we see that the tall urns have a cap or lid that is surmounted by a floral or foliate terminal that is quite distinctive. This motif re-appears in Silkstede's frieze and in stone carving in the presbytery screens which will be described below.

Aside from the very fine detail in the carving of the Gaillon work, so that the lobes of the urns have a 'feathery' treatment, we may notice that the overall feel of the Gaillon urns was carried across into the St Cross work. I have noticed the alternating squat and tall urns but when we look closer at these motifs we find that the detail is also carried across from the one work to the other, thus character of the rims and stands of the urns in the Gaillon work is to be seen, if slightly modified, in the St Cross work. One aspect of the Gaillon urns is the use of leaf-like stands (fig. 32). This technique is applied to the urns that appear in the Morning Chapel sections of lower tier frames (fig. 105) and, if in a somewhat cruder fashion, in the panels of Silkstede's frieze that is described below.

Scrollwork

It is self-evident that the carvers of the Gaillon work were able to achieve not only a finer line of cut in their work but that they could also aspire to a greater level of complexity in the intertwining of the rinceaux. Thus in the Gaillon work we can see curls that enclose a further curl which, at St Cross, could not be achieved. However,

when we compare the detail of the Gaillon scrollwork it soon becomes clear that, detail for detail, the Gaillon scrollwork is echoed in the St Cross frieze. So that the plumed (*i.e.* the not horned) dolphins in the Gaillon work have the same characteristics as those in the St Cross frieze. The treatment of the plainer scrollwork in the St Cross setting takes similar stylistic traits. I mentioned the treatment of volutes with their foliate cladding above, and this method of stylistic treatment extends to all the plainer scrollwork at St Cross. An especially interesting example of this is a section of scrollwork that can best be described quite simply as 'filling' and is best seen in panels of the north screen upper tier at St Cross. Panels N3u and N4u (figs 85 and 86) show short sections, or spurs, of scrollwork emerging from the bodies of the fantastic creatures that lie across the base of these panels to extend upwards to the ogee arch frame. At the mid point of these spurs of scrollwork are pairs or single leaves set either side. This is quite a small piece of work, rather inconspicuous and somewhat lost in the wider detail of the overall work. But they echo almost precisely scrollwork in the Gaillon panels. In the G4 medallion panel, stall 6 of the north range, we examined earlier is a similar spur (fig. 20). This can be seen in the bottom corners of the panel, it emerges from the curled volute and fills the space between the volute and the fantastic bird. The same device appears also in one of the G7 panels (fig. 27) where again it is an insignificant detail, it emerges from behind the griffin backs, but is nonetheless characteristic. The transference from the Gaillon work into the St Cross work of this spur, and it is an almost exact copy, offers yet further confirmation that the two friezes are closely linked.

Transmitting the designs

The many links between the two sets of work have been outlined above and are further underlined by the numbers of motifs that appear in the pilasters at St Cross that had previously been executed amongst the Gaillon work (figs 18 and 91-93. However, while there are many parallels there are also a number of differences, the most obvious being that the St Cross work focussed on a series of profile heads in medallions with, perhaps as a secondary point of focus, a double series of prophets and sibyls. At Gaillon, where every surface is covered with carving or intarsia work,

it is less easy to categorically define a focal point but the two tiers above the seat backs, G2 and G4, with their sibyls and virtues in the one and historiated scenes from the life of St Anne and of St George in the other, can be deemed as central in this work. These changes of emphases tends to enhance the connections rather than diminish them. It is clear that the designer/s of the St Cross work either had an intimate knowledge of the Gaillon carvings or, possibly, had detailed drawings of the Gaillon work which enabled them to design a new work that incorporated Gaillon motifs around a wholly new centrality of design. Such drawings, if ever executed, do not now exist but there are other drawings which can be associated with carved work at Gaillon.

The work at Gaillon was, as we have seen, clearly created by a team of French craftsmen many of whom are named in the expense accounts. There is even a reference to a man who drew six drawing of the chairs of the chapel, although it is far from certain as to what this actually implied but it is possible that these were not design sheets for individual panels but rather an overall general design for the entire suite of work.[9] We need to bear in mind the complexity of this work. The surviving stalls were created from no less than sixteen individual elements (G1 to G16, and see fig. 16) with further work in the desk and the screens. This figure can then be multiplied by the variations of theme in individual panels so that while each type is generically similar there are a number of stylistic changes; thus, for example, the G4 seat backs as we have seen contain a wide range of imagery but, as a group, conform to an overall design. The same can be seen of the St Cross stalls where there are clearly three identifiable themes: the north, south and (now largely destroyed) lateral ranges.

The six drawings mentioned in the Gaillon building accounts may have been general designs for the suites but the designs for individual panels must have come from somewhere else and appear to be unrecorded. This lost set of drawing work was presumably made either at Gaillon or in Rouen, and while it is possible that they might have been drawn by a Frenchman – we know from the expense accounts that Colin Castille was carving work in the *antique* style at Gaillon some years before contributing to the work on the stalls – but the possibility that they were created by

9 See above in Chapter 2 and see Appendix 1.

an Italian should not be overlooked. On this point, we can again turn to the expense accounts, as I described in the chapter on Cardinal d'Amboise, and show that there were a number of Italians present at Gaillon in this period. Amongst these men were the painter Solario, and sculptors Antonio di Giusto and Gerolamo Pachiarotti, the latter being responsible for the *all'antica* carvings on the frame made to surround Michel Colombe's altar frontal.[10] All of these men could have been capable for creating the designs needed for the chapel stallwork units.

There is of course a further source to be considered and that is prints. I discussed above how prints have often been perceived to be a design source for this type of work and expressed there my scepticism that this was an appropriate means by which designs were transmitted. In particular I drew attention to the parallels to be drawn between a set of prints and carved work in St George's chapel, Windsor. While the prints do indeed offer a general sense of design that underpins the idea of the carvings, what they most certainly do not do is provide an actual design template. I drew attention in the last chapter to the possible sources for the sibyl panels, suggesting the possibility that a *Book of Hours* by Laval might have offered a general sense of overall design for these panels but not the actual blueprint from which the marquetry makers worked. Nevertheless there are in fact some prints that might have offered the designers at Gaillon some direct ideas and designs to take complete into their carvings. Marquet de Vasselot recognised that some of carving on the *petit cloiture* from Gaillon bore a close affinity to the work of three Italian engravers: Zoan Andrea, Antonio da Brescia and Nicoletto da Modena.[11] More recent research has added a further engraver, Giovanni Pietro da Birago, to this list.[12] Of considerable interest to us is that Andrea and Birago were both working in Milan in the early 1500s where their work could have been brought to the attention of Charles d'Amboise. He was then the French governor of Milan and, as I noted above, the nephew of Cardinal Georges d'Amboise for whom Charles enthusiastically gathered men, materials and artworks in order to further his uncle's ambitious patronage at Gaillon.

10 See above in Chapter 2, for details of these artists.

11 Vasselot 1927, 364.

12 Levenson *et al*, 1973, 272-74 and figs 102-13 ; see also Adams *et al*, 1980, 57-58; and see Rieder 1977, 351.

Jacquelyn Sheehan, in describing Birago's work, drew attention to a particular characteristic of his work, 'the compositions thus emphasise vertical and horizontal axes that tend to restrict the movement of figures ...', which, aptly, encapsulates much of the relief work at Gaillon.[13] Twelve ornamental panels by Birago and Andrea are in the collections of the National Gallery of Art in Washington (USA) and are dated 1505-1515; one of these appears to be the design source for one of the *petit cloiture* panels (fig. 138). What is interesting is that the Gaillon carving is not a direct copy but a re-arrangement that carries a strong similarity to Birago's original. Further, there is a strong sense of identity in the French work that speaks volumes for the transition of the style, this is not copy work but more a realisation in a Franco-Italian style of the original. Unfortunately, it seems that only these twelve engravings have survived and all of them show complex candelabra designs. However, many of the motifs that appear in these engravings can also be found in different arrangements in the Gaillon stallwork panels – but with one major difference, Birago's candelabra are heavily populated with putti while the Gaillon stalls are not. Additionally, the horned creatures that are such a characteristic element of the Gaillon work are in the main absent from Birago's engravings where there is but one serpent-like creature with horns along with some putti who appear as satyrs. Nevertheless, the fact that even one of Birago's drawings can be seen as a close parallel to one of the Gaillon panels indicates that there may have been others, these since lost.[14]

While we appear to have a reasonably clear understanding of the design sources for the Gaillon stalls and which we can show as probably a fusion of Italian prints with local French style, perhaps somewhat influenced by the presence of Italian artists working on-site at Gaillon, we cannot reach the same conclusions for the St Cross work. Clearly there is no case to suggest a direct use of engravings such as Birago's, and because of the direct parallels to be drawn between St Cross and Gaillon, we need not look further than Gaillon itself – or the patronage of Cardinal

13 Sheehan, in Levenson *et al*, 1973, 273.

14 Birago's engravings also find an echo in manuscript miniatures painted for Cardinal d'Amboise in Rouen *c.*1503, see for example Paris, bibliothèque Mazarine, ms. 1581, f. 1r, which shows the title page from Josephus' History of the Jews; this is illustrated in Gennaro Toscano 'Temoind d'Italie' in Arminjon *et al* 2004, fig 13.

d'Amboise – to discover the design sources for the work at St Cross. The overall design and specific, individual panel designs at St Cross are such that whoever created them must surely have previously worked in this style. This was not a first design, but one that is not simply based on the Gaillon work but one that was fully re-designed and re-formulated to fit a new setting. This is not the work of a novice, nor the work of a cathedral trained carver who had previously, and by obvious context, only ever worked in the Gothic style. The St Cross work is clearly a fully fledged, mature piece. It is confident in its sweep of curve and subtlety of positioning and has an assurance of range.

Taking all these factors into consideration this must leave the conclusion that whoever designed the St Cross work was fully aware of the Gaillon work and may even have been a member of the team that created it. Further, whoever actually carved the St Cross work (and this could have been an individual, although as several hands seem to be apparent in the work, a team of several carvers seems more probable) had almost certainly previously worked in France. We cannot even be certain that the frieze was actually carved on-site at St Cross, there is no reason to suggest outright that the frieze could not have been carved in France, possibly Rouen. Even were we to test the wood to discover whether it was English oak or not, this would not greatly assist us as the Gaillon accounts reveal that Irish oak was used in the creation of the stalls there. That said, the complexity of the setting at St Cross and the bi-angular pilaster posts point to a requirement for the creators of this work to have had a very close, detailed knowledge of the exact dimensions of the setting for success to be assured. For this reason I would suggest that the frieze was crafted at St Cross, and for the reasons outlined above, I further suggest that French craftsmen were responsible for its creation.

The problem of dating the St Cross frieze

If the frieze at St Cross had been erected in a French setting then there would be no great difficulty in assigning it to the *premier* Renaissance and suggesting a date of 1510-1515 on the basis that it is demonstrably an early application of the *all'antica* style, unsophisticated and relatively simple. To suggest such a date for a piece of

work in an English context would, in the current academic debate, be unacceptable. We cannot look to Torrigiano's work on the tomb for Henry VII and Elizabeth for a guide to dating the St Cross work as his style was very different. That said, given that Bishop Fox was involved in the negotiations for the making of this tomb, it is possible that he was introduced to the idea of utilising Italianate styles in a public, religious setting in the early 1510s. This might have influenced him to patronise the *all'antica* style in the work to be commissioned for St Cross. The problem with this is that Fox did not otherwise observably patronise the style until the 1520s when the presbytery screens in Winchester cathedral were erected and capped with *all'antica* friezes. These works do however offer some insight into the problem. They will be discussed in some detail in chapter 12 below but we can for the moment look at the possible sequence of work in the cathedral and see what light this reflects on dating the St Cross frieze. The presence of a frieze created for Prior Silkstede in the south transept of the cathedral has been noted above and this will be described below in chapter 10. This frieze incorporates design ideas from the St Cross frieze but is neither a copy of the St Cross work nor was it created by those who made the St Cross frieze. Silkstede died in 1524 which indicates that his frieze ought to be dated to the last years of his life and a bracket of 1520-24 seems reasonable. This can to an extent be supported by the presbytery screen friezes which have a date of 1525 carved on the stringcourses below them, this perhaps indicating a completion date for this work. These friezes are not at all like the St Cross work, but, as will be explained, there is a traceable evolution of work that leads from the Silkstede frieze though a series of tombs built into the presbytery screens and leads on into the presbytery friezes. With all of this completed by 1525, it seems reasonable to suggest that this sequence opens at least as early as 1520. We can therefore with some confidence suggest that the St Cross frieze should be dated to not later than 1520.

The other end of the bracket – the earliest date for the St Cross frieze – is more difficult to arrive at. It is however possible to suggest that Henry VIII's war with France, one in which Fox himself participated,[15] offers a possible date mark to Fox's career and one which also saw his increased interest in using St Cross as a 'retreat' or alternative home which enabled him to escape the duties of a highly

15 This is discussed above in Chapter 4.

politicised bishop in order that he could immerse himself in his deeply felt spirituality. Fox returned to Winchester from Henry VIII's war in 1514, and soon after resigned the privy seal and retired from life at court to concentrate on the issues of a diocesan bishop and to the difficulties presented by founding his Oxford college of Corpus Christi. We know from Fox's letters that he was often at St Cross and this may have sparked his interest in first making some general improvements to the church (such as installing the stone-cut screens brought there from the nearby but then de-commissioned church of St Faith) and later adding a sumptuous suite of stalls with its splendid *all'antica* frieze. In the Smith and Riall survey it was suggested that the frieze was created in time (20 June 1517) to provide a setting for the inauguration of Fox's new Oxford college, Corpus Christ, a view that we can see being reinforced by the fact that John Claymond was the first president of this college and was also master of St Cross.[16] It was suggested Claymond had a hand in the patronage of the frieze and stallwork. There is in fact no reference at all to Claymond in the frieze and nothing that indicates any possible connection with Corpus Christi, unlike the presbytery screens and the presbytery aisles where the patronage of others involved in these works is recorded. In all probability, Claymond was an absentee master as he appears to have been so deeply involved in both the presidency of Magdalene College, Oxford, and in the organisation for the building and setting-up of Corpus Christi that he could hardly have been able to execute an active role at St Cross. If there is no reference to Claymond, there are aplenty to Fox and it seems altogether more likely that in this project he was the sole patron. In my view therefore, this removes the linkage of the frieze to the inauguration of Corpus Christi and permits an earlier date to be contemplated.

We may reflect back to my earlier comments where I show that the work at St Cross closely parallels that at Gaillon, work which I showed above was almost certainly completed by 1510 although further work on the stalls went on in subsequent years up to 1518. Given the closeness of style I suggest that the dating should be similarly close and that the period immediately after the war with France offers both a

16 Smith and Riall 2002, 143-45.

reasonable date and a window of opportunity that permitted such a project to take place. I therefore suggest the frieze was created in 1514-15, it is not impossible that it could be earlier, but it is also likely that a later date is also applicable. The most probable date is therefore a date range of 1514-20, with *c.*1515 the date I intend to work with here.

Chapter 10:

All'antica ornament in Winchester cathedral 2: the patronage of Prior Silkstede

AN IMPORTANT STAGE BETWEEN the realisation of the frieze at St Cross and the wider application of *all'antica* ornament was, I would argue, the creation of a set of stalls with an *all'antica* frieze for Prior Thomas Silkstede. Compared with the St Cross frieze, Silkstede's is less than beautiful and poorly carved (fig. 141). It is evident that it is based upon the designs expressed in the St Cross frieze and added a few new motifs, but it does not have the complexity or the intellectual challenge of the St Cross work. It is nevertheless an important evolution in the transmission of the style, and as such must be studied because of what it brings to the next series of works – these being the presbytery screens and tombs beneath them.

Prior Silkstede

Thomas Silkstede became a monk at St Swithuns sometime before the late 1460s, when he was listed amongst a group of sub-deacons. He was elected sub-prior in 1484 and then prior, in succession to Prior Hunton, in 1498. Silkstede died in 1524 and although he had had a chapel prepared for his interment, he was buried elsewhere in the cathedral. Silkstede was directly associated with a number of works

in the cathedral including the refurbishment of the Lady Chapel,[1] the quire pulpit,[2] and his own chapel in the south transept. He also appears to have been associated with the insertion of the wooden vault over the presbytery; a boss with his initials is amongst the heraldic devices there.[3] Additionally, he commissioned a chest, now in the church of St Blasius at Shanklin, which has some traces of Renaissance style in its decorative treatment.[4]

Silkstede's interventions in the south transept

The process of rebuilding the east end of the cathedral had been started in the episcopates of Courtenay and Langton and was continued by Fox.[5] In the final phase of these works, the presumably still-remaining Romanesque exterior walls of the presbytery aisles were removed, the roof lines lowered and new arcades of windows – in the latest 'Court style' – were inserted. Externally, these arcades provided further perches for Fox's pelican, clearly identifying this work as his. These arcades were extended westwards beyond their junction with the two transepts, where the butt-ends of the transept walls can today be seen through the most westerly of the presbytery arcade windows (fig. 140). The implication of this is that Fox appears to have intended to remodel the transepts, again removing the Romanesque features and earlier Gothic windows, replacing these with Tudor court-style work. This view is given some weight by the evidence of 'temporary' roofing timbers in the transepts. These were inserted in preparation for the lowering of the transept aisle roofs; this programme of work was never completed but the roof timbers remain *in situ* (fig. 142).

1 On the Lady Chapel, see Draper and Morris 1993, 177-193; and Tracy 1993, 231-46. Silkstede may have been portrayed in the glass lights of the Lady Chapel window where an ecclesiastic, wearing a blue cope kneeling at a desk, may be he; on this glass, Le Couteur 1918, 139-66.

2 On the Quire pulpit, see Jervis 1976, 25.

3 It is possibly significant that Silkstede's initials are absent from the bosses in the Presbytery aisles, although the diocesan arms of keys and a sword do appear.

4 For a description of this chest, see Smith 2002, 14-19.

5 The late fifteenth and early sixteenth century development of the cathedral is poorly documented in modern studies so much so that there is no connected narrative that describes this work since the account given in Victoria County History 5. Courtenay's work is marked by the presence of his arms on the exterior of the east end.

Why and when did Fox abandon this programme of work? As I argued above, it seems the most likely explanation for abandonment was Fox's desire to concentrate almost solely on the building and endowment of his Oxford college, Corpus Christi rather than a continuation of work on the cathedral.[6] A most likely date for this is soon after 1515, following Fox's return from the campaign in France, a point in time that appears to have marked a change in Fox's personal interests as well as his political career.

It can therefore be argued that it was Fox's loss of interest in redeveloping the cathedral that provided Silkstede with the opportunity to make his mark in the south transept, one he seems to have seized upon to make a substantial impact by creating a chapel for himself, as well as a suite of stalls, presses and a frieze all ornamented in an *all'antica* style. Thus in the south transept of the cathedral may be found Silkstede's chapel and stallwork with a frieze. The latter was the subject of a paper written by myself;[7] I need not replicate the full content of that paper here but there are a number of points that require to be addressed. These include the connection between Silkstede's frieze and the St Cross frieze together with the later terracotta tombs of East Anglia, in conjunction with the place of Silkstede's frieze in the development of the cathedral in the early Tudor period. Additionally, Silkstede's frieze may have been the source for designs used in a stone-cut frieze at Thruxton which I will describe in later chapter. As the frieze would appear to be closely connected with the adjacent chapel, Silkstede's, it is also necessary to make some comment on that structure here. Therefore, I need to include a description of the salient points of Silkstede's frieze here.

6 On Fox's college of Corpus Christi, see above pp. 118-19.

7 Riall 2003, 209-25.

Silkstede's chapel

Silkstede's chapel occupies the central bay of the east aisle of the south transept (fig. 45). The chapel is separated from the transept by a stone screen and from the bays either side by wooden screens dated to *c.* 1400.[8] The chapel is linked to Silkstede by an inscription set across the outer face of the stone screen that separates the chapel from the body of the transept (fig. 144). The screen itself was probably originally created for Bishop Adam of Orleton (bishop 1333-45) but was appropriated by Silkstede who modified it for his own use.[9] The inscription is composed of a series of initials, carved in stone, and set on small shields dispersed at regular intervals along the string-course of the screen (fig. 144). The inscription offers an interesting interplay between Silkstede's name and an iconographical function. The letters are executed in both upper and lower case and dispersed across five shields as follows: **T ho MA s S.** This can be read as Thomas Silkstede, but the significance of giving some of the capitals a greater weight suggests that here the letters also refer to the Virgin Mary (**MA**) and *hominum salvator* (**ho s**).[10] The lettering is executed in the same neo-Renaissance style that is to be seen on Silkstede's chest[11] and in the vault of Langton's chantry (fig. 46).[12] The inner face of the screen, and paralleling the initials on the cornice, is provided with a series of floral motifs including a rose and the dimidiated device of rose and pomegranate, for Henry VIII and Katherine. At least, this is the case today. An engraving showing the interior of the chapel, made by John le Keux from before 1820, shows a different series of motifs and, along the outer face of the screen, a cresting that has since vanished (fig. 142).[13] The engraving also shows a lettered panel lying on the chapel floor. But, as the inscription has been recorded in

8 Jervis 1976, 10.

9 On Adam of Orleton, see Kipling 2001, 19-34. Kipling points out that it is possible that Orleton planned to build his chantry chapel between the rood screen and *pulpitum* screen, and may even have done so but that it may have fallen into disuse by the sixteenth century thus enabling Silkstede to move the screen and re-use it.

10 Milner 1839, 31; Biddle 1993, 262.

11 See Smith 2002, 14-19 and figure therein.

12 The script form in Langton's vault is described above, see p. 132

13 A print of this drawing appeared in Owen Brown Carter's *Picturesque Memorials of Winchester*, 1830, and is reproduced in Riall 2004, but the drawing itself may be earlier.

local histories from at least 1760, it seems unlikely that Silkstede's initials have not been in place since first being placed here in the early sixteenth century.

Silkstede was buried elsewhere in the cathedral, or leastways, if he was buried in his own chapel he was removed from it sometime after, perhaps another result of the Reformation and its impact on the cathedral.[14]

Silkstede stalls

Arranged along the south wall and part of the west wall of the south transept, forming an L-shape that is punctuated by doors in both sections, is a set of wooden canopied stalls with benches (fig. 145).[15] This contains a series of Renaissance motifs, set as a frieze, carved on rectangular panels amongst which are to be found Silkstede's initials, **T S**. The entire set of stalls is panelled in linen-fold work, although it is clear from even a cursory examination of the setting that some of this cannot have been original to the setting. All of this timberwork was remodelled through the direction of the dean, Rendell, in 1818;[16] this resulted in the re-arrangement of the fixtures and fittings in the south transept. This appears to have completely displaced the original work and added further pieces, both nineteenth century and earlier, to create a new set of fittings. Trying to disentangle this has resulted in some interpretations that are not wholly acceptable. Might the stalls, if this is indeed what they originally were,[17] have once lined the west side of the transept? This is certainly a possibility on a reading of an early history of the

14 There is no contemporary documentation for Silkstede's burial and the subject has not been explored in print beyond to note the facts of the matter.

15 As previously noted, this work was described in Riall 2003, 209-25.

16 He had his intervention marked with his initials and date on two of the panels in the frieze.

17 Ball 1818, 222, noted that there were 'some old wainscot presses carved in scrolls somewhat similar in design to those of Silkstede in the south transept of the cathedral' to be then seen in the rooms of the entrance tower at the Hospital of St Cross. These have since vanished. Ball's comments infer that the stalls in the cathedral were similarly presses (or cupboards). This is discussed further below.

cathedral.[18] Another view suggests that Silkstede's frieze was intended originally to be part of a set of stalls that once fitted out Silkstede's chapel.[19]

The back of this woodwork is mostly panelled in linenfold arranged in three tiers divided by stiles and rails reaching up to the canopy (fig. 145). The linenfold panelling in the eastern part of the south section is here arranged in two tiers with pilasters carved with Renaissance motifs between pairs of panels. Fronting the canopy is a frieze of panels with, at each end and in the angle between the two sections, a medallioned profile head. Two doors, neither of which belongs to the original scheme, punctuate the stallwork. The main points of interest here are the panels that make up the frieze, and the pilasters amongst the linenfold.

The 21 panels (hereafter numbered 1 to 21 reading from left, or east, to right) that make up the frieze are filled with designs that are based on Renaissance models. These designs include the letters T S and the arms of the see of Winchester which are supported by fantastic creatures and antique work; this clearly identifies an association of this woodwork with Thomas Silkstede. Amongst these panels are at least two that are of nineteenth century date, panels Slk10 and Slk11, and these have carved on them the initials T R and the date 1816. These refer to Thomas Rennell (Dean, 1805-40), whilst the date presumably indicates either a substantial refurbishment of the stalls, or, as is more likely, a general rearrangement which included the provision of a new doorway through the west side of the woodwork into a newly formed chapter room. Rennell's alterations almost certainly included changes to the doorway leading southwards from the transept.[20] The full extent of Rennell's work remains unknown, but it is clear from earlier descriptions of the cathedral that woodwork with Silkstede's initials carved on the cornice was present in the south transept from before the 1760s.[21] This is not apparent in the earliest drawing of the transept, a view by John Coney of 1817, which shows stallwork, doors and finials along the top of the frieze but, curiously, does not show any carved panels in the frieze itself. This may perhaps be simply explained by suggesting that

18 Warton 1760, 98.

19 Jervis 1976, 9-10; and see Biddle 1993, 262-3 who suggests as an alternative use the possibility that these stalls, or rather the frieze (?), were created to replace the Lady Chapel screen; see also Tracy 1993, 240.

20 Biddle 1993, 261-2

21 Warton *c.*1760, 98; and see also Ball 1818, 101 and Milner 1839, 2, 78

Rennell's renovation lasted longer than appears to be the case and was completed at some point after Coney's drawing.

The dominant *all'antica* feature of this woodwork is the series of oblong panels set as a frieze along the upper edge of the canopy (fig. 145). Along the south side there are 15 panels (two, as noted above, are nineteenth-century) with a further six panels along the west side. The *all'antica* character of the frieze is echoed by the presence of seven pilasters with capitals that are set amongst the linenfold panelling in the eastern part of the southern section beneath the frieze (figs 150-153). The use of *all'antica* motifs on just the frieze and pilasters echoes the arrangement at St Cross where the *all'antica* work is confined to the frieze and desk ends. Both sets of woodwork appear to have been panelled in plain linenfold.

A common overall design was used in the decorative scheme here; this was a central motif or element with affronted supporters that, chiefly, merge outwards into scrollwork. This basic theme was developed, in the playful Renaissance manner, into a range of specific images taking individual central motifs or differing supporters to create a range of images that conform to a central theme, thereby producing four sets of designs. The panels are all carved in low-relief on single boards, although the execution of these designs was not as accurate as might have been expected in such a scheme for a setting of this quality. There are lapses in the symmetry which seem surprising and which were surely not intended together with minor omissions of detail, when panel is compared to panel, which is similarly unexpected. These relatively minor discrepancies have not been taken into account in this analysis, but are of importance when considering the craftsmanship of this work, and, as we shall see, it is in the fine detail that so many of the clues as to the origins of, and parallels to, this piece lie.

Silkstede's frieze

The following sections consider in turn the constituent motifs carved on the panels: dolphin with urns, heraldic shields, Silkstede's initials and rebus, medallions, and the capitals and pilasters that remain from the stall backs below the frieze. The frieze itself is interesting for its re-use of motifs and designs that were previously expressed in the St Cross work. But, and of more import, is the inclusion of motif designs in the pilasters that recur in the cathedral presbytery screens, these offering a link between the two works. The frieze panels offer the main connection between the wood-carved work of the St Cross and Silkstede friezes. Almost all the other designs, such as the dolphins and birds, along with the medallioned portraits, virtually disappear from the later work all of which was executed in carved stonework although some were used in the stone-cut frieze, dated 1527, for the Lisles at Thruxton;[22] a work I will describe in some detail below in Chapter 14.

Panels - Design 1 and 2: Dolphins with urns.

The most frequent motifs in this frieze are shown in the dolphin and urn panels. Much of the south section, panels 1-9, along with panels 16 and 21, comprise panels carved with a central motif of an urn supported by affronted dolphins. These 11 panels can be divided into two groups based on close examination of the urns and of the detailing of the scrollwork around the dolphins.

1 Dolphin and urn 1 [panels 1-5] (fig. 146): the central motif is a lobed urn with a beaded rim resting on a foliate stand with a central foliate motif emerging from the mouth of the urn. Either side are affronted and horned dolphins, the horns having an ear-like characteristic, whose beaks rest on the urn rim. The dolphin bodies are drawn out into scrollwork leading to a form of cornucopia from which emerges further thick stemmed and 'twiggy' scrollwork that terminates in a floral design – perhaps intended to represent a Tudor rose. Slashed scrollwork emerges

[22] This is now to be seen erected around the parapet of the church tower and should not be confused with the canopy friezes above the Lisle tomb within the church.

from beneath the dolphin and is returned towards the urn. The significance of the horned dolphins heads will be discussed below.

2 Dolphin and urn 2 [panels 8, 9, 16 and 21] (fig. 147): this is a simplified version of the last design, the horned dolphin is replaced with a plain version and the overall design is asymmetrical. The same lobed urn is used, though here it is narrower and taller. The affronted dolphins are accompanied by a less complex layout of thick stemmed scrollwork. Close examination of the dolphins with their scrollwork reveals a consistent asymmetrical character to these panels that is unusual in Renaissance contexts. This is especially noticeable in the treatment of the scrollwork emerging from the dolphin bodies, with the left quite different to the right.

The urn in panel design 1 has a wide and some what extended, slightly drooping lip which is characteristic of the *all'antica* style. The lip is often treated with a beaded decoration, as can be seen in both examples here (fig. 146). Emerging from the mouths of both urns is what appears to be a floral motif and these are quite similar to motifs that appear amongst the pilasters (figs 150-153); we can also compare the urns in the panels with those shown in the pilasters, and these are clearly from the same basic design and carved by the same hands. This serves to link the panels and pilasters and show they were always part of the same work if perhaps not today organised as they were originally.

Panels - Design 3: Heraldic shields.

Arms of Winchester with supporters [panels 13, 15, 17 and 19]: four panels bear the arms of the see of Winchester with two versions of supporters, affronted dolphins [panels 13 and 15] and affronted griffins [panels 17 and 19] (fig. 149). The dolphins in these two panels are the same as those employed on the right-hand side in the dolphin and urn 2 series. The griffins are shown with strings of beads terminating in tassels emerging from their mouths (these beads representing perhaps a rosary, but they are also a frequent Renaissance motif); the griffins are otherwise relatively plain compared to the treatment of the dolphins. A curious inconsistency amongst these panels is the depiction of the arms of the see of Winchester. Panels 13, 15 and 17

show the keys running from bottom left to top right, with the sword crossing from the right, whereas panel 19 shows this arrangement reversed (not illus).

The arms of the see of Winchester were depicted many times in settings in Winchester Cathedral during the early part of the sixteenth century. They appear in the Lady Chapel and Langton's Chapel, on bosses in the vaults over the presbytery and aisles, in Fox's chantry chapel and on Fox's presbytery screens, these together providing over 25 examples. This reveals almost equal numbers of each form of the see arms, showing the crossed keys and sword depicted crossing one way or the other. Depiction with Fox's pelican, with Langton's arms, or alone seems to have no bearing on the matter, for the see arms are depicted both ways, side by side, on the vault of Fox's chantry chapel.[23]

Panels - Design 4: Silkstede's initials and rebus.

The initial TS with supporters [panels 12, 14, 18 and 20]: in these panels the central motif is formed by the initials TS, for Thomas Silkstede, tied together with a skein of silk (Silkstede's rebus) formed by rope set in a clover-leaf design terminating in tassels, supported, in panel 12, by dolphins and by griffins in the remainder (fig. 148). The initials TS are carved in a cursive style reflecting the early sixteenth century development of a display scripts based on Romanesque originals that were being produced to replace the long-used black-letter forms.[24] Similar lettering, if with significant differences, appears on the adjacent screen to Silkstede's chapel, on the faces of the south presbytery screen, and on Silkstede's chest.

The treatment and design of the griffins varies from one panel to the next, so that there are minor variations in the placement of these beasts' paws, the treatment of their heads and their tails. In panels 18 and 20 the tail is almost non-existent. Like the panels with the arms of the see, the griffins here have ropes with beads terminating in tassels with, from one panel to another, minor variations of detail.

23 Pers. obs. I am grateful to Robert Yorke, Archivist of the College of Heralds, for his comments on the differences in which the see arms were displayed; and see further in Riall 2003b.

24 Gray 1986, 148-50.

Medallions.

Three medallions are included in the frieze; one at the eastern end, one at the junction between the two sections and the third at the end of the west section. All three feature male heads in profile within medallions set into a square field, with floral decorative motifs in the corners. The carving of all three is relatively crude, with little attention to detail or attempt to give these profiles any character. The first medallion shows a male head facing right. He wears a cloak or toga and is wearing a plumed helmet with neck piece. A similar, but much later image is included in the Winchester College frieze, now displayed in the Winchester city's Westgate museum.[25] The medallion is framed with a laurel wreath emphasising a classical connection. The second medallion, here shown with a plain slashed rim, shows a male head emerging from a clothed shoulder and wearing a soft cap or hat. He is shown with square cut hair and would seem to be a contemporary figure, perhaps intended to represent Silkstede himself (*cf* the medallion by Torrigiano of Sir Thomas Lovell in Westminster Abbey).[26] The last medallion, again within a plain slashed frame, depicts a bearded male figure facing left with, co-joined, another face facing right. While this could be identified as a classical parade helmet, an alternative identification suggests that this medallion represents the Roman god Janus, here shown facing two ways as the god of doorways and passages, and also of beginnings and endings, and the god of gates with a key in his hand which might be both an ironic play on the Winchester see arms and a deliberate allusion to this setting: the monks' entry into the cathedral with the night stair close-by.

Medallions did not re-appear in any cathedral work until the 1539 choir desk fronts were carved and these can be clearly shown to be derivative of the St Cross frieze. Outside the cathedral, medallions were incorporated in the frieze at Thruxton, now on the church tower, alongside panels that appear to be based on panels in Silkstede's frieze.

25 Lewis 137-165.

26 The medallion of Sir Thomas Lovell is illustrated in Marks and Williamson 2003, 152, cat no 9 and Pl 13.

The capitals and pilasters

Seven capitals set atop pilasters are to be seen in the eastern section of the south range of the stalls, set between the canopy and the mid-point rail of the back of the stalls (figs 150-153). The capitals all conform to a similar design theme, a Renaissance-styled Corinthian capital, but there are subtle differences to each, so that no two are exactly alike. The capitals project very slightly forwards to provide carved surfaces on three sides, again a design feature to be found at St Cross. Each capital has a pair of in-turned volutes rising from leaves, presumably acanthus, with a beaded rim that is occasionally surmounted by a flower. The volutes are all slashed and, in form and style, reflect the scrollwork emerging from the dolphins in the panels of the frieze.

While the rectangular panels of the frieze and the capitals reflect a transmission of design ideas and style from the frieze at St Cross, the pilasters introduce a new element that finds full no parallel in the St Cross work. We may note also that the Silkstede frieze is the only extant work in the cathedral to include dolphins and also a series of capitals.[27]

The pilasters do not extend the full length from capital to the mid-rail in the panelling, but have been cut some 200 mm above the mid-rail; the lower, undecorated, section of timber is a later addition (fig. 145). This suggests that in its original form, and assuming that the pilasters were used to divide the panels in the back of the original woodwork, there was a horizontal rail set across the base of the pilasters, echoing the arrangement in the frieze at St Cross, which must lead us to conclude that the linenfold panels now present cannot have been in this position, if at all, in the original layout. While there is strong sense of conformity about both the pilasters and capitals, close inspection again reveals a surprising level of differences, so that they are not in fact all similar, but reveal a set of three pairs (pilasters 1 and 7, 2 and 6, 3 and 4) with a fourth design, pilaster 5.

[27] Carved stone-work in the cathedral collections includes fragments that are covered with dolphins, cornucopia, floral motifs and other *all'antica* work in an interlaced design that catches the spirit of the St Cross/Silkstede work but is most likely from the late 1520s or 1530s. Their original purpose is unknown. I am indebted to John Hardacre for showing me these pieces and providing me with photographs of them.

The pilasters are decorated in low relief with a range of motifs that includes foliage, ribbons, urns, drums and beads, set, candelabra-fashion, one above the other. Some of these motifs are familiar from the St Cross frieze, in particular the drums, urns and, if a little changed, the floral motifs set towards the base of each pilaster. Quite novel to this assemblage is the arrangement of the motifs; these are more closely set together and the candelabra string although obvious, is not omnipresent in the way it is in the St Cross frieze. Most particular of the novelty of these pilasters is the introduction of a calyx with flowers which tops each candelabrum (figs 150-153). These re-occur in the decorative panels on the tombs in the north arcade of the presbytery screens and also in the frieze that caps that screen. The overall tone of the style applied to the pilasters clearly is echoed in the panels of Pontoise's tomb,[28] and is especially noticeable on the north-facing tomb panels, where the two series of candelabra, tomb and Silkstede's, are closely matched. More particularly, the calyx in pilaster 4 is echoed by those seen in the south-facing panels of the tomb, while the volutes towards the bottom of pilaster 7 have been inverted in the right hand panel of the north face of the tomb.

Biddle saw the workmanship of the stalls as being far less competent than that of the work in the presbytery, and the style of the tombs as being considerably more advanced than that applied to Silkstede's stalls.[29] This judgement was based on the use of cartouches in the work on the tomb panels, a feature that of course does not appear in the work on Silkstede's stalls and, arguably, thereby invalidates Biddle's conclusion. As we shall see, the stylistic trait that connects the craftsmanship of the stalls is paralleled by imprecise workmanship that resulted in unsymmetrical designs being carved, rather than the metronomic, highly accurate, symmetry which we saw was a feature of the St Cross frieze.

28 Pontoise's tomb is described below, see pp. 286-90.

29 Biddle 1993, 263 and *Ibid.* 267.

Purpose

While it is perhaps possible that this frieze could have been intended as a replacement for the Lady Chapel screen, it seems unlikely to have been intended as part of a suite of stalls for Silkstede's chantry chapel. The geometry and layout of the chapel would have inhibited fitting it out with a regularly aligned suite of stalls. The door into the chapel is set on one side, the left, preventing stalls from being set out either side of the chapel, while inside the chapel there are parts of four massive Romanesque piers that intrude deep into the body of the chapel (fig. 142). These too would have provided an obstacle to creating a set of stalls. We might also question the need for stalls at all; it was only Langton's that was lined with stallwork while the other five still extant (Beaufort, Edmonton, Fox, Gardiner, Wayneflete and Wykeham) have no such fittings. Overlooked by Biddle is a further description, one which provides a possible explanation for the frieze,

> '... the ancient presses ranged along the south wall of the transept. These presses are carved in scrolls and terminate in canopies, bearing on the cornice the initial and device of Prior Silkstede, by whom they were probably erected for the purpose of containing the rich vestments worn on all solemn occasions by the monks of the cathedral.'[30]

It follows from this that while it is possible that, in part, Silkstede's woodwork in the south transept incorporated some stalls or benches, its main purpose was to serve as a cupboard to house the monks' clothing. That canopies with richly ornamented friezes were occasionally attached to such pieces of furniture can be seen in a piece, on a smaller scale, drawn in c. 1527 by Hans Holbein in his Study for the Family Portrait of Sir Thomas More; another cupboard, made for John Wyn ap Maredudd of Gwydir in c.1525 also features a canopy fronted with a frieze and this is set above a large cupboard with six doors and two drawers.[31]

30 Ball 1818, 101. As Ball also mentions a 'modern' entrance to the chapter room this rather suggests that Dean Renell's re-organisation of the south transept was a rather more protracted affair than at first meets the eye.

31 On the John Wyn ap Maredudd cupboard, see Bebb 1992, 63-73 and fig 12. This cupboard is now in the Burrell Collection, Glasgow.

Dating Silkstede's chapel and frieze

The presence of Silkstede's initials clearly indicate the work is unlikely to be later than 1524, the year of his death. Looking for the start date of this project is more complicated. If the woodwork was simply associated with a set of presses, or cupboards, then the relative ease with which these could have been moved would not make their presence in the south transept conditional upon Fox having abandoned his aim of re-working the fabric of this part of the cathedral. If however we were to suggest that Silkstede's woodwork was more complex, and that it was a combination of both presses and stalls, which, on the basis of the numbers of surviving panels and other pieces involved, seems a real possibility, then this would not have been so readily moveable and could most likely have only been erected after Fox lost interest in rebuilding the transepts. The style of the work could mean, in theory, that the woodwork was assembled anytime after *c.*1510, the date for the completion of the first phase of the Gaillon stalls. Such an early date seems unrealistic for the Silkstede work, which anyway is most likely to post-date the St Cross frieze on the basis that the dolphins with horns that appear in Silkstede's frieze are imitations or copies of the St Cross frieze dolphins.

On the basis that Silkstede's chapel and his frieze are the product of work executed after Fox abandoned his plans for the remodelling of the cathedral, then Silkstede's work can be dated to *c.*1516 x 1524 and a date of *c.*1520 would probably be the best estimate we can expect. This date also takes into account the possibility that the carving on the pilasters of Silkstede's stalls influenced the design choices for the work on the Pontoise tomb group alongside the probability that the date of 1525 inscribed on the screens must represent a completion date. By dating Silkstede's stalls to *c.*1520 this would allow a four-to-five year period for the creation and installation of the presbytery screens. In the wider context of *all'antica* work, the Silkstede stalls can be seen as a stepping-stone in the adoption of the style, rather than being of great importance themselves. It is also interesting to observe that that the style itself was achieving a wider acceptance and we may consider here also the

probability that similar furnishings with in a similar design style were also present at St Cross in the domestic buildings of the hospital.[32]

Outward transmission of design ideas from Silkstede's stalls

The design ideas and *all'antica* motifs included in the frieze and pilasters of Silkstede's stalls re-appeared in the tomb panels in the north presbytery frieze in the cathedral, and something of the style of the frieze panels also appears in the work of the south presbytery screen frieze. The dolphin with urn panels of Silkstede's frieze were also modified and copied into the terracotta panels of the tombs in East Anglia, especially those at: Layer Marney (fig. 134), Oxborough and Wymondham. The composition of these panels, with their horned dolphins linked by rinceaux with a strong floral content is strikingly similar to the Silkstede stall panels. However, while it is possible to show a link between the terracotta panels and Silkstede's stalls, the overall designs of these tombs includes much further work that did not appear in any Winchester work. Lastly, and as has been noted above, there is a strong sense of design connection between Silkstede's frieze and work at Thruxton, which, as I shall show, was probably the work of the cathedral master-mason, Thomas Bertie – to whom we can now turn.

[32] These were mentioned in Ball's description of St Cross, described above in Chapter 6, but these pieces of furnishings have since disappeared.

Section Three

Thomas Bertie

'my lorde of Wynchestres Mason'

Chapter 11:

Thomas Bertie of Bearsted, Kent (*c.*1487-1555), 'My Lorde of Wynchestres mason': a biography

THIS IS THE OPENING CHAPTER of the last section of this dissertation, the aim of which is to explore the wider application of *all'antica* across Hampshire and the specific contribution of one mason, this being Thomas Bertie.

Lacking the documentary evidence, it is impossible to identify who designed and carved the frieze at St Cross. Moreover, the St Cross is virtually one of a kind, with little of its content replicated or paralleled in other, later works. The same cannot however be said about the wider application of *all'antica* work in settings across Hampshire, including a significant set of works within Winchester Cathedral. Many of these are strikingly similar. Discovering the identity of any artisan – be he a mason or a carpenter or a glass-maker or glass-painter – working in the early Tudor period and linking him to a series of extant works is generally difficult at best, and is virtually impossible once we start looking at minor works of architecture or sculpture. This would also be the situation at Winchester but for the presence of some monograms painted onto the presbytery south frieze and some clues in the documentary record. These, combined with the physical evidence from friezes, tombs and other pieces of carved work from sites across Hampshire, potentially reveal the activities of a single man who was at once 'my lorde of Wynchestres

mason'. This man was Thomas Bertie. In this chapter, Chapter 11, I provide a biography in which I will outline his career and his work, which I then explore in some detail in Chapters 12, 13 and 14.

Thomas Bertie – introduction

Thomas Bertie has been linked with work in Winchester Cathedral from at least the late nineteenth century when G. W. Kipling published his transcript of the *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St Swithun's Priory*, which includes the *Custos Operum* roll of 1532-1533, within which payments to Bertie are recorded.[1] At much the same time it was realised that Thomas also appeared amongst the documents calendared from the reign of Henry VIII,[2] these showing that he was active as a mason working on the artillery forts built along the Solent in the 1530s; and, additionally, that Bertie was employed by Thomas Wriothesley to convert Titchfield Abbey into a country house. All of these documents relate to work in the 1530s and later. The documentary record linking Thomas Bertie to any work prior to 1530 is entirely lacking; there is nothing earlier than 1532 that specifically informs us what Bertie was employed to work on. From John Harvey's work on English medieval architects, a fuller appreciation of Bertie's work emerged although, as will become apparent, this was only part of the story.[3] My intention here is to readdress Harvey's biography of Thomas Bertie, and to present a range of evidence that shows the extent of Thomas's work and to offer a definition of his style. In many respects, the key to this problem is the Lisle chapel and tomb at Thruxton and it is with this that I shall begin my description of Thomas Bertie's life and work.

1 Kipling 1892, 215-223. I discuss below what these payments relate to, see p. 275.

2 *Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic of the reign of Henry VIII*, ed Gardner *et al.* 1862-1932.

3 Harvey 1984, 31-33.

The Lisle tomb at Thruxton – crucial documentary evidence

The Lisle tomb at Thruxton sheds an interesting light on the problem of identifying Bertie as the mason responsible for creating it. Here can be seen the remains of a chapel, with a particularly ornate tomb and surround covered in *all'antica* decorative motifs, that conspicuously parallel those employed in the cathedral presbytery screens amongst both the friezes and the tombs. More importantly, this tomb has also some documentation that provides both dating and indicates its maker. Sir John Lisle[4] included instructions in his will (this is dated May 1520 although Lisle did not die until the spring of 1523)[5] for the construction of 'an ambulatory chapel unto the honour of God and of our blessed Lady Saint Mary Virgin mother of our Savyour Ihu Crist'. This was to be erected, Lisle specifies, on the north side of the chancel of Thruxton church.[6] The work cannot have been completed – if indeed begun at all – as four years later his widow left instructions in her will to her executors to 'cause to be made a Chapell or an ambulatory after the plott and bargayn made by my husbonde wt my lorde of Wynchestre's mason'.[7] Thus, while we would anyway associate the work at Thruxton with the same workshop, and therefore probably the same mason, as that from which the Winchester material emerged on the basis of the very striking similarity between the two sets of work (and I will demonstrate the validity of this statement below), the documentary record clearly shows that we should look to Bishop Richard Fox's mason as the probable author of the work. This interpretation serves to diminish the possibility that 'foreign' carvers, as suggested by Harvey,[8] were employed to carve the *all'antica* detailing on these works and, in my view, gives greater credence to the probability that it was an English-trained mason who executed the work.

4 In his will, he is named as Lysle while his wife, in her will, is named Lysley. It is clear from the opening lines of this will that Lisle drew, or had drawn up, his will in response to the command from Court to attend the embassy departing for France to meet with the French at the Field of the Cloth of Gold.

5 National Archives PROB 11/21(formerly listed as PCC, 19 Bodfelde); and see VCH Hampshire **4**, 1911, 389, n.66.

6 John Lisle's father, Nicholas, was, by the terms of his will (PROB 11/15; previously PCC, 7 Adeane), buried on the south side of the chancel at Thruxton.

7 PROB 11/21 (formerly PCC, 27 Bodfelde); and see VCH *op cit.*

8 Harvey 1954, 32-33; and see Whinney 1964, 6.

The combination of the stylistic traits employed in the decoration of the Lisle tomb and its monumental surround alongside the identification of its designer as the Bishop of Winchester's mason leads us back to Winchester, where further pieces of evidence demonstrate that the mason involved should be identified as Thomas Bertie.

Monograms on the presbytery south frieze.

Martin Biddle commenting on the presbytery screen friezes in the cathedral remarked that we do not know who the carvers of the presbytery screen friezes in the cathedral were, for there is no documentation recording the creation of this work.[9] However, as he also pointed out, there are potential clues painted onto the south face of bay S2, where four monograms appear (fig. 154):

to the left of cherub B	**h' B**	(or R B)
to the left of cherub C	**I B**	(a ligature for ? J B)
to the left of cherub F	**R**	(no ligature apparent)
to the right of cherub F	**T B**	(painted as a ligature)

Do these represent the monograms of the carvers who worked on the frieze? Is it significant that all three surnames begin with B? Could they refer to Thomas Bertie and, if so, does this mean we can accept that this is a record or the signature of those who created the frieze? The lack of a documentary record makes it impossible to be certain but, as an indicator of authorship, the monograms offer a strong clue to the mason's identity. Although the documentary record is silent with regard to the identity of masons working in the cathedral for Bishop Fox, we do have some records which place Thomas Bertie in Winchester during this period.

9 Biddle 1993, 274.

Thomas Bertie – what's in a name?

When John Harvey wrote his biography of Thomas Bertie, as part of his wider study of medieval architects, he referred to him as Berty, although he noted the name could be spelt also as: Bartewe, Barthew, Bartiewe, Bartiue, Bertie, Bartuu, Bartyew, Bert, Bertie and Bertye.[10] This proliferation of spellings should counsel caution in accepting that all these names necessarily refer to just one man but, as will become clear, this does indeed seem to be the case. Harvey spelt Bertie's name as Berty.[11] This is in fact incorrect; the surname survived following the spectacular marriage of Thomas's son, Richard,[12] to Katherine Willoughby (she had previously been married to Charles Brandon, as his fourth wife following the death of Henry VIII's sister, Mary Tudor).[13] Their descendants, including the earls and duke of Ancaster,[14] continued to use this as the family name: spelt as Bertie. Richard seems to have attempted to escape his paternal family, and hide his humble origins, but to no avail as some details of his ancestry were recorded in the later sixteenth century.[15] The Bertie arms were first granted to Thomas Bertie in 1550.[16] When Richard married Katherine their armorial bearings were co-joined. Significant details from these are of some importance here, as I shall show below. However, as far as the descendants of Richard Bertie were concerned, details of Thomas Bertie seem to have been confined to his career after 1530 when he was described as 'a distinguished architect',[17] and

10 Harvey 1954, 32.

11 *Ibid.*

12 On Richard Bertie, see the biography by Susan Wabuda 2004; and below *passim*.

13 On Katherine Willoughby, see the biography by Susan Wabuda 2004; and see the entry under Willoughby in GEC *Peerage*, 673-675; on Charles Brandon and his many marriages and life as Henry VIII's boon companion, see Gunn 2004.

14 On the Earl of Ancaster, see Debrett's 1923, *Peerage, Baronage, Knightage and Companionage*, 43-45.

15 He was described as being 'no gentleman, by ancestry that is' by the Earl of Arundel. On Richard's parentage, see Lady Cecilie Goff, 1930, *A Woman of the Tudor Age*. Richard was also described by his own wife as being 'meanly born', on which, see under Katherine Willoughby in GEC *Peerage* at p.674 under note c; and see the useful essay that rebuts much of the Bertie family history as myth in Round 1910, 1-54.

16 The arms were granted under Edw. VI, 10 July 1550, see Round 1910, 29-33; Harvey 1954, 32. The arms feature three battering rams set one above the next on a blank field, are these an oblique reference to Bertie's role in demolishing the monasteries?, with a saracen's head as a crest.

17 See Round *op. cit.*, and Wabuda 2004, on Richard Bertie's early life.

later as Captain of Hurst Castle. Thomas's early life seems to have been, perhaps quite deliberately, obscured.

It is nonetheless the spelling of Thomas's surname, in its various guises, that allows us to connect him to many building projects after 1532. We can be reasonably certain that this is 'our' Thomas as there were no other contemporary masons who bore a name that was of a similar spelling or phonetic pronunciation. The fact of Richard being Thomas's son, and the geographical connection to Bearstead, revealed through the grant of arms to Thomas in 1550, allows us to build a much wider and more detailed picture of Thomas Bertie's life and career.

Although Harvey outlined Thomas's life and achievements as an architect-mason, he did not connect Thomas to East Tisted, Sherborne St John or Thruxton, which, as I will show below, form part of the corpus of work that should be linked to him.

Thomas Bertie c.*1485-1555.*

Harvey observed that in the will of Robert Berty, mason, of Bearsted in Kent (proved 17 February 1501/2), one Thomas Berty was mentioned as the elder son and then aged under 20.[18] The relevance of this becomes clear when we note that 'in 1550 Thomas Bertie of Bearsted, Kent, Captain of Hurst Castle, received a grant of arms.'[19] This establishes a clear link between Robert Berty of Bearsted, Kent and the father of Thomas Berty, and Thomas Bertie of Hampshire. Amongst the provisions of Robert Berty's will, his sons Thomas and William were left their father's working tools, 'working toles such as be for macyns crafte', which implies that both were masons like their father. William thereafter disappears from the documentary record.

The next documented mention of Thomas, as Bertie, appears in 1516/17 when he was living in the High Street, Winchester, just the period when Fox's chantry

18 Harvey 1954, 32

19 *Ibid.*

chapel was being erected.[20] Harvey noted that Thomas's son, Richard, was born in Hampshire during Christmas 1517.[21] We do not know anything of Richard's childhood, and the next documented mention of him relates to his admission to Corpus Christi College, Oxford, then aged sixteen in 1534.[22] This was Bishop Fox's foundation, and it seems entirely probable that Richard's place at the college was made possible through Fox's patronage and, quite possibly, Thomas Bertie's continuing employment as mason by the new bishop, Stephen Gardiner. Richard Bertie left Oxford in 1539 and entered the household of Thomas Wriothesley; here was another strong family connection, as Thomas was the architect-mason who transformed Titchfield Abbey into a country house for Wriothesley. In later years Richard was noted for his facility with languages, and especially with Latin, French and Italian. Is it possible that his early schooling in Winchester was, in part at least, carried out within Bishop Fox's household? The development of Richard Bertie's early life points to a father who was much favoured and held in some esteem by his patron, Bishop Fox, and who was given over sight of some very prestigious projects.

Although there is no documentary record we can nevertheless speculate as to how Thomas Bertie's earlier career progressed. One of the first questions we require to find an answer to is how was it possible that a mason from Kent found himself in Winchester? Unnoticed by either Harvey, or Biddle, is a possible linking factor, the master mason William Vertue. Thomas's father, Robert Berty, had been part of the team that worked on the late fifteenth- and early sixteenth-century work at Canterbury cathedral;[23] this work also involved many of the leading master masons of the time, including the Vertue brothers.[24] Robert died in 1501/2 when Thomas was perhaps about sixteen.[25] Is it possible that Thomas Bertie, perhaps then working for or with his father, came to the attention of William Vertue during these works, and

20 Biddle 1993, 274.

21 Harvey 1954, 32.

22 Wabuda 2004. Round 1910, 34, commented that as the record was dated in the 10th year of Clement VII this would make the year of Richard's entry 1532/33, but this would still fit the record of Thomas Bertie living on High Street, Winchester in 1516/17. Richard's name is recorded in the university documents as *Ricardus Bartewe* and *Barthewe*.

23 On Canterbury Cathedral, see Woodman 1981, 211-17.

24 On Robert and William Vertue, see Harvey 1954, 270-274.

25 Harvey 1954, 32 who, on the basis that Robert Berty's will shows that Thomas was underage, suggested that Thomas was sixteen in 1501/2.

that Vertue persuaded Thomas to join his team following the death of Robert Berty? Alternatively, did Vertue later encounter Thomas Bertie on another of the archiepiscopal projects, such as the development of one of the archbishop's palaces, for example Croydon or Knole or Leeds castle, the last of which is but a short distance from Bearsted? Fox might himself have recruited Bertie. However, it seems the more likely that it was William Vertue, in his capacity as Bishop Fox's senior master-mason, who brought Thomas Bertie to Winchester, there to join the team assembled to carry out Fox's intended programme of work of removing the surviving Romanesque work that enclosed the presbytery and formed the transepts and tower, replacing these with windows and masonry in the latest Tudor court-style.

It seems quite possible that Bertie arrived to work in Winchester sometime before 1515, where he would have been employed under Vertue in the re-working of the east end of the cathedral. He would next have been involved in creating the presbytery aisle vaults, before becoming involved in the design and erection of Fox's chantry chapel. We can possibly associate the volutes in Fox's chapel with Bertie's workmanship (fig. 52), an indicator of his early interest in the Renaissance style and its application and use on architectural works.

Lisle heraldic badges in Winchester cathedral

Work on the presbytery aisle vaults may well have brought Bertie into contact with Sir John Lisle for the first time. Previously unreported are the arms of Lisle amongst the bosses in the presbytery aisles as well as in the main vault over the presbytery.[26] Although this device, a sunburst, was occasionally used amongst early Tudor royal heraldry (based on Edward IV's sun in splendour badge), the Lisle device of a sunburst through clouds (fig. 155) seems to be somewhat different to that used by the Tudor kings. The Lisle bosses appear once in each of the following bays in the presbytery aisles: 1N, 3N, 1S, 2S and 3S – the badge does not appear amongst the

[26] While the main vault over the presbytery has attracted quite a considerable level of scholarly interest (see e.g. Lindley 1993; Smith 1996) the aisle vaults have been largely ignored. The Lisle badge appears twice only in the main vault, amongst the smaller bosses either side of the central line of larger bosses.

heraldry in the main quire vault.[27] The style of carving of the Lisle bosses in the cathedral is close to that of the heraldry displayed at Thruxton (fig. 156), and this offers yet another link between Thomas Bertie and these works. The bosses with the Lisle crest also speak of a far closer relationship between Lisle and Bishop Fox than has hitherto been realised, a relationship that is barely hinted at amongst the few documents for the period that show Lisle's role in civic and military affairs in Hampshire during this period. Lisle's badge represents the only Hampshire family to appear in the aisle vaults; the remainder of the crests are drawn from amongst the Royal heraldry, the arms and devices used by Fox or the Cathedral, and alongside symbols from the *Arma Christi*. The presence of the Lisle arms may also mark the date when Lisle and Bertie first met, and might have sparked Lisle's interest in having Bertie design and build a chapel and tomb at Thruxton for himself and his wife.

The main presbytery vault was probably constructed prior to 1509 but the aisle vaults were probably not started until after 1513. Philip Lindley noted that amongst the documentation relating to Corpus Christi was an indenture of 1513 which specified that any monies left over from building Fox's Oxford college was to be applied to '... the new makinge & vaultinge with stone of two Ilis upon either side of ye said Churche & the vaultinge of the Cross-Ile in ye said Cathedrall Church of Winchester ...'.[28] As I noted above when discussing Fox's chantry chapel, the building of which appears to have begun sometime around 1514-15, the aisle vaults had to have been completed (or at least that section spanning Fox's chantry) before work could begin on Fox's chantry and this clearly implies that before 1515 the aisle vaults had been erected. The main presbytery vault, as Lindley shows, was probably created between 1503 and 1509.[29] As Lisle's badge is shown here too, it would seem that Fox and Lisle were associated from early in Fox's episcopate.

* * *

27 The bosses in the presbytery aisles are arranged as a polygon holding eight bosses set around a central, larger boss with a further four bosses at the cardinal points of each bay with the east/west bosses common to an adjacent bay (see fig. 159). The Lisle badge occurs amongst those on the polygonal ring whenever it is shown.

28 Lindley 1993, 117.

29 *Ibid.*, 115-17.

If we take the monograms on the south frieze as definitively indicating Thomas Bertie as their author, we can move onto firmer ground and see more clearly an identifiable association between mason (and carver) and sections of work. This work (I will describe this in the next chapter) was undertaken in the early 1520s and was perhaps completed by 1525. Nonetheless, it should be noted here that Harvey felt that while Bertie was the mason, an unnamed foreign craftsman did the actual carving.[30] Harvey offers no evidence to support this, and it seems to me just as valid to suggest that Bertie himself was capable of both designing the work and executing it himself, *all'antica* alongside Gothic.

Thomas Bertie as the bishop's mason.

As Bishop Fox's mason, it is possible that Bertie was involved in the work at St Cross, assisting with setting up the frieze and associated woodwork, possibly in 1515-1517. It may also have been he who carried out the move of the stone screens brought, so tradition asserts, from St Faith's to be erected in the east bays of the chancel at St Cross.[31]

Subsequently, Bertie went on to work at various sites across Hampshire (fig. 157). The first of these was a tomb, and perhaps a chapel, at Sherborne St John for the Brocas family sometime in the 1520s. Following this, he built a chapel and tomb at Thruxton in *c.*1524-27 for the Lisle family. Next came a chapel at Christchurch Priory for Prior Draper, which carries a date on its frieze of 1529; and then probably in the 1530s another tomb, this for the Nortons at East Tisted. All this work can be linked through the style of the workmanship combined with the striking similarity of the designs employed; this will be discussed in detail below. An interesting detail at East Tisted is the presence of a crest featuring a Moor or a Saracen's head (fig. 158). The same head later appeared amongst the arms granted to Thomas Bertie. Was it the Norton's arms that inspired Thomas Bertie to choose the same device for himself? It

30 Harvey 1984, 33.

31 The removal of these screens from St Faith's to St Cross is discussed above, see pp. 143-44.

can hardly be a co-incidence that Thomas carved the head for one of his patrons and then later employed it in his own arms.

Back in the cathedral, it is possible that Bertie worked also for Prior Silkstede and erected for him the screen across the west face of the Silkstede chapel (fig. 144); nothing Renaissance here, but more simply the re-use of an existing screen with some new additions all in a Gothic idiom. This all took place before 1524, which is when Silkstede died. The presence of the initials of Silkstede's successor, Prior Henry Broke, on the north door through the presbytery screen, and on a shield on the screen itself, may well indicate that Bertie was either working for the prior (and by extension for the cathedral also) or that Broke made a financial contribution to the work. Harvey suggests that Bertie built the Pole chantry at Christchurch.[32] This seems unlikely to me; the work on this structure is in a quite different style to that of the other works cited here and yet, there are suggestions amongst the *all'antica* work that supports Harvey's comment, a point I will discuss further below.

It is conceivable that Bertie also worked on the Holy Ghost chapel at Basingstoke for Bishop Fox and Lord Sandys in the early 1520s.[33] There is nothing specific about this structure to support such a view, other than to suggest Bertie because he may well have been Fox's senior mason, leastways certainly in Hampshire.[34] In this respect, it would seem possible that Bertie was involved with the renewal of the south transept of Netley Abbey (Hampshire), a work that Fox patronised and which was marked by the use of his pelican device on some of the roof bosses.[35]

32 Harvey 1984, 33.

33 This chapel has not been the subject of a detailed, published architectural survey but was the setting for the Renaissance glass now to be seen at the Vyne; on which see Wayment 1982. Pevsner 1967, 91 describes the chapel as brick built. This is incorrect; the chapel was built in locally quarried clunch. *pace* Maurice Howard who suggests (pers. comm.) that the chapel was brick built and stone faced. A detailed survey and partial excavation would clarify this minor problem.

34 Fox had building work undertaken at the monastic church of St Mary Ovary, this stood alongside the bishop's palace of Winchester House, and included work on the roof and a new great altar screen, but Bertie can hardly have worked on this in addition to the building projects in Hampshire.

35 Pers. comm. Angela Smith.

Much of Bertie's work was associated with chapels, especially with tombs and memorials; thus, it is conceivable that some potential work, which could have been erected in monastic churches, was lost following the Dissolution.

As we have seen from the documentary evidence, Bertie was working on the fabric of the cathedral in the early 1530s. Does this indicate the bishop no longer primarily employed him? The documentary evidence is lacking, but with a new bishop installed – Stephen Gardiner – it is possible that Bertie may have found himself undertaking minor works in the episcopal houses across the bishop's estate, for it is probable that these had become somewhat neglected in the final years of Fox's episcopate. We cannot necessarily assume that the priory gave Bertie permanent employment, even though the 1532-33 *Custos Operam* roll includes a reference to a retainer being paid to him,[36] as this is the only roll to survive from the period during which Bertie was potentially working on the cathedral. This roll also shows that Bertie had anyway been involved in some quite extensive works amongst the presbytery vaults. Harvey thought that this entry revealed that Bertie was erecting these vaults,[37] but the ubiquitous presence of Fox's pelican makes it clear that this is not the case and that the vaults were erected much earlier. I have suggested above that this work was executed before 1515 when work began on constructing Fox's chantry chapel. What appears to have been done in 1532-33 was to carry out some quite substantial repairs to the vault over St Swithun's shrine.[38] The entry in the roll states, 'Et in solutes Thomæ Bartewe pro pacto secum exconventione facto pro reparatione dicti valti pro parte sue cs.'[39] A few lines earlier the same roll shows Thomas claimed 5*s*. for another aspect of the same work. In reality, it is very likely that Thomas was co-ordinating the entire work and that payments in the roll to other men mask his own contribution and role. The extent of the work recorded in this roll, together with Thomas annual retainer,[40] may well indicate that we should quite probably understand from this that Thomas had for

36 Towards the end of the roll we find, 'et in stipendis Thomæ Bartew Cementarii de feodo per annum, 13*s* 4*d*.', (Kipling 1892, 222).

37 Harvey 1954, 32.

38 Biddle 1993, 274.

39 Kipling 1892, 219.

40 His stipend was one of several paid but seems to be the only one that was a retainer rather than a stipendiary salary, see Kipling 1892, 222.

some time previously been part-employed by the priory alongside his working relationship with Bishop Fox.

The Dissolution of the monasteries brought with it opportunities for skilled masons such as Bertie. The spring of 1538 found him working for Thomas Wriothesley at Titchfield (Hampshire).[41] Here the buildings of the dissolved monastery were to be converted into a grand courtier house.[42] He also appears to have started work at Beaulieu, here also converting the former monastic buildings into a house for Wriothesley.[43] In common with a number of other leading architects, masons and builders at this time, Bertie was soon after involved in the creation of a string of artillery forts along the Solent.[44] Correspondence between the local authorities and the king and his council, reveal that the mason 'Bertie' was working on the fort at Calshot in the spring of 1539,[45] then in September of that year (as 'Bertie') he was associated with the work on the two forts at Cowes.[46] Later still 'Bertie' was working on the fort at Hurst, to which he was appointed captain. As 'Bertie', Thomas was employed on work on a now razed fort, Hasilworth, in 1546. Two of the forts, Calshot and Hurst, have panels over the main gates that were once filled with the royal arms.[47] A particular feature of these is the use of *all'antica* motifs in very distinctive Renaissance frames. This too is a feature of the near contemporary

41 *L & P* XIII/I,749, 12 April 1538, in which Craiford noted in his letter to Wriothesley that he had 'yesterday and today consulted with Bartyew about widows and chimneys...'; and see Harvey 1964, 33; Hare 1999, 19.

42 On this, see Rose Graham in Graham and Rigold, 1976, 5-6. Graham erred in her judgement that it was through Wriothesley's patronage of Thomas Bertie that he prospered sufficiently that his son was enabled to marry Katherine Willoughby. The documentary record for the conversion of the Titchfield is covered in W H St John Hope, 1906, 'The making of Place House, Titchfield, near Southampton in 1538', *Archaeological Journal* **63**, 231-43.

43 Hare 1999, 17. It is possible that Bertie advised on the work of remodelling at three other dissolved Hampshire monasteries: Southwick, converted for Thomas White (he was a servant of Wriothesley; see Soc Med Archaeol News 31, 2004, not paginated); Wherwell, for Lord de la Warr; and for Lord Sandys at Mottisfont, all of which were undergoing conversion at the time; on this, see Hare 1999, 17-20.

44 The literature on the artillery forts along the shores of the Solent is extensive and can be readily accessed through the bibliographies in Kenyon 1978 and Kenyon 1983, with more recently, regular essays in the journal *Fortress*. Bertie's role is discussed in passing in *L & P*; for the relevant references, see the description of the forts by Martin Biddle and Sir John Summerson in Colvin 1975, at 512, 527, 537, 540, 541n, & 557.

45 *L & P* XIV (i), 573; the definitive guide to this fort is Coad 1986, although he does not mention Bertie's involvement.

46 *L & P*, 14 (i), 573.

47 Pers. obs.; and see English Heritage guidebooks to both sites.

work at Cowdray (Sussex);[48] was this building another that Bertie worked on or was the style more widespread? Further and detailed fieldwork is required to before this problem can be resolved.

The Reformation and the creation of the string of coastal forts may well have taken Thomas Bertie away from Winchester Cathedral on a permanent basis but he nonetheless maintained an association with the cathedral. In November 1538, the Prior granted Bertie 'a rent of 40*s* for his laudable services in the past, with the supervision of the works of the monastery.'[49] The same year Bertie was granted a lease for 81 years on two tenements with their gardens 'on the east side of Kingsgate Street and on the south side of the former Whitefriars.[50] The lease also names Bertie as bailiff of the Soke, indicative of his civic status outside his role as a mason and architect. It seems entirely probable that Bertie continue to be employed by the cathedral authorities after the Dissolution, but the documentary record to support this supposition is lacking.

Thomas 'Bartuu' died in 1555 having received a grant of arms, as Thomas 'Bertie' of Bearsted, Kent[51] – this of course providing the link that completes the circle linking Bertie of Winchester with Bearsted and Bertie. The arms feature three battering rams, 'sylver three faulcys of Mottons the bodys of tymber hedded armed azure horned asure upon the tymber a ryng of the same two above one'.[52]

There is no record of Bertie ever having gone to war and the battering rams are likely to be a reference to Bertie's employment in the demolition of monasteries. He was still captain of Hurst castle,[53] and he still owned property in Winchester.[54]

48 Pers. obs.; *all'antica* work of this period is only now visible in the vault of the entrance tunnel of the inner gate and in some of the details of the plaque of Royal arms above the gate.

49 Harvey 1954, 32.

50 *Ibid.*

51 On this grant, see Round 1910, 29-34, who makes it clear that Thomas was the first to be granted arms.

52 *Ibid.*, 29.

53 *Ibid.*

54 An inventory of his house taken shortly after his death survives but contains no references to any tools of his trade or a workshop, pers. comm. Karen Parker who is working on sixteenth-century inventories from Hampshire for her doctoral dissertation.

Chapter 12:

All'antica ornament in Winchester Cathedral, 3: the presbytery screens

THE REMODELLING OF THE PRESBYTERY screens marked the final phase of Renaissance work in Winchester cathedral during Fox's episcopate. The purpose of this chapter is to explore how these screens came to be created, the *all'antica* work carved on them and to set the screens in the wider context of tomb monuments executed in the *all'antica* style across Hampshire.

The presbytery occupies the three bays to the east of the quire and terminates with the great screen that was erected in the later fifteenth century (figs 38 and 159).[1] We do not know if there were earlier screens here, dividing the presbytery from its aisles although it is clear that there were a number of pre-existing tombs set between the piers, these dating from the eleventh century and onwards. It may be significant that the south door in the presbytery screens is probably Bishop Waynflete's work,[2] and therefore mid to late fifteenth century; however, there is a 'tradition' in the cathedral that the door was moved here from another location.[3]

1 On the Great Screen, see Lindley 1989, 604-15 and his more general comments in Lindley 1993, 123-138; see also Hardacre 1989, 21-33 for descriptions and illustrations of the figure sculpture from this screen.

2 It was identified as such by Philip Lindley in a letter to Martin Biddle, quoted in Biddle 1993, n.59.

3 Pers. comm. John Hardacre, curator of the collections of Winchester Cathedral.

As with all the other work undertaken in the cathedral during Fox's episcopate there is no documentary record that outlines what was done, who executed it or what it cost. The screens bear the date 1525 and have heraldic references to Bishop Fox, his steward William Frost and the letters H P for Prior Henry Broke (prior 1524 - 1536) which tell us something of who the main patrons of this work were.[4]

In outline, the early sixteenth-century work in the presbytery saw the introduction of two arcades of fenestration punctuated by doors on the north and south sides (fig. 159). These arcades were capped by two sets of frieze-work, with string-courses between, and on top of these were placed a set of mortuary chests (figs 160 and 161).[5] Where the arcades over-ran earlier tombs these were renewed with fresh stonework, with those underneath the north screen executed in an *all'antica* style.

All of this has been described by Martin Biddle who proposed a chronology, sorted out many of the problems posed by the display of heraldic motifs on the screens and identified the main sponsors of the work.[6] However, he did not comment on the incongruity of the combination of this work – the mixture of emphatically Tudor court style and *all'antica* – nor did he fully address the problem posed by a series of perpendicular windows set amongst a range of *all'antica* motifs which, themselves, are so varied as to also demand more comment.[7] It is this variety of the *all'antica* ornament that is so puzzling and may well lie behind Anthony Blunt's comment in which he linked this work to Gaillon.[8] Unlike the frieze at St Cross, and Silkstede's woodwork described above, the presbytery pieces cannot, at first sight, be portrayed as a co-ordinated and fluent piece of work necessarily emanating from a single workshop and all created at the same time. The tombs differ from the north door, and these from the two friezes, which are themselves different one from the other, while the mortuary chests form yet another group of pieces,

4 Biddle 1993, 270-1 discusses this patronage in some detail.

5 *Ibid.*, 263-278.

6 *Ibid.*

7 Additionally, and as has been noted previously, Biddle's description and discussion of the presbytery screens in the cathedral in wholly inclusive and excludes any comments on parallels with the work to be seen elsewhere in Hampshire.

8 Blunt 1969.

stylistically different and, in other settings, illustrative of diverse themes that could easily be dated well apart.

The Renaissance work in the cathedral screens has only ever been considered in isolation, it has never previously been considered as apart of a wider group of work that extends across Hampshire and includes four other substantial and significant settings: the Pexall, Lisle and Norton tombs and surrounds and the chapels for Pexall, Lisle and Draper, the last of which being the only one of these to have been previously mentioned in print.[9] It perhaps hardly needs to be added that the potential author of all this work, Thomas Bertie, has similarly been ignored. The apparent lack of correspondence amongst the Winchester assemblage calls into question any thought that this was a single programme of work but, when we dig deeper, we soon discover that there is in fact a strong stylistic theme that runs through much of the work. It is for this reason that the same principle of describing these pieces of work in fine detail, which I adopted for describing the St Cross and Silkstede friezes, is followed here.

I will outline here the chronology that I intend to follow, but I shall substantiate this in the specific chapters devoted to individual topics below: thus the work in Winchester Cathedral is discussed in this chapter and the other Hampshire work in chapters 13 and 14. Almost none of the work is dated and there is almost no documentary evidence that offers any dating evidence. Moreover, Silkstede's frieze (described above in chapter 10) introduced stylistic motifs that do not appear in the frieze at St Cross but which were re-used amongst the work executed for the new tombs (hereafter Pontoise tomb group) placed along the line of the cathedral north presbytery screen. Prior to that, work had begun on the south presbytery screen but it has to be said this has only a very loose connection with either the St Cross or Silkstede friezes. The carving of the south presbytery frieze parallels that used for the Pexall monument at Sherborne St John, although the Pexall tomb itself was executed in the same style as the Pontoise tomb group. The next work in the

[9] Not described by Biddle, although he mentions the work in a footnote, is a stone-carved frieze portions of which are kept in the stone-store in the north transept of the cathedral. The style of the pieces indicates a date into the 1520s if not the 1530s and need not concern us here, but their presence reminds us that material has, conceivably, been lost from within the cathedral.

sequence was probably the presbytery north screen with this being followed by the Lisle tomb at Thruxton that can be dated to after 1524-27, on the basis of the two Lisle wills and an inscribed date on the work there.[10] Much has been made of the date, 1525, inscribed on the presbytery screens and this has generally been accepted as the date when these were carved. I shall show that this is probably a misconception, and that what the date actually records is a completion date for the entire work of creating a new set of presbytery screens. The Draper chantry, with its inscribed date of 1529 (similarly to be seen as a completion date – or, perhaps, a devised ceremonial 'topping-out' date for the entire programme of work from first drawings to final touching up must surely have been started some years earlier), follows with the Norton tomb completing the sequence. I will return to the problem of dating, and chronology, when I discuss each work in turn.

St Cross frieze	*c.*1517
Silkstede frieze	*c.*1520
Presbytery south screen frieze	*c.*1520-23
Pexall monument at Sherborne-St John	1520-25
Tombs in presbytery north screen	1522-25
Presbytery north screen frieze	1522/3-25
Presbytery north screen door	after 1524 but by 1525-28
Lisle monument at Thruxton	1524-27
Lisle ambulatory chantry	*c.*1527
Draper chantry	1529
Norton tomb at East Tisted	after 1530?

Table 10: Outline chronological sequence of Thomas Bertie's monumental work across Hampshire.

10 On the Lisle tomb at Thruxton, see Chapter 13.

Design themes – meshing all'antica *with Gothic*

The central problem with exploring the Winchester presbytery screens has been hitherto to consider them in isolation. This, I suggest, has had a number of repercussions, not the least of which has been to see a stylistic divide between the two cathedral screens, alongside a suggestion that they were created as an *ad hoc* solution to enclosing the presbytery, rather than being understood as a considered architectural solution. Much hinges on the idea that the friezes that over-run the screens have a '... tacked-on appearance. Although the vocabulary is Italianate, the syntax – a frieze without a surmounting cornice – is not.'[11] As the designs for the Pexall, Lisle and Draper tomb and chapel settings demonstrate (figs 162, 163 and 164), this combination of frieze in an otherwise "ungrammatical" setting was clearly fully intentional. I would argue that there never was an intention to create a classical setting, but rather to take ideas from the classical repertoire – and even this is an idea that as a concept is difficult to fully support – to create something novel, and yet retain a sense of the traditional by incorporating Gothic elements. A substantial element of the problem is that we simply do not know to what extent masons such as Thomas Bertie were aware of Classical architecture and the rules that governed its application. Given the un-classical nature of both Bertie's work and that displayed in the East Anglian terracotta tombs, the suspicion must be that they were aware of the elements of style but had not been formally trained as to its usages.

This stylistic mixture found its apogee with the design and creation of a chapel screen created in 1529 for Prior Draper in Christchurch Priory (fig. 164). Here a blind lower dado screen with trefoil mouldings, which echoes the interior of Bishop Fox's chantry chapel, supports a pair of windows that are capped by a stringcourse upon which is carved an inscription that includes the date 1539 and which in turn is topped by a frieze that has a crennelated crest. The whole face of the structure is carved with *all'antica* motifs, most particularly in the frieze which closely matches the Winchester Cathedral north presbytery screen frieze. One important aspect of the cathedral friezes is absent at Christchurch: the shields on the stringcourses. These however are present on the Pexall and Lisle tombs (figs 162 and

11 Park and Welford, 1993, 138 n. 62; and see Biddle 1993, 269.

163), and on a second frieze, for the Lisle's chapel, at Thruxton.[12] The Pexall tomb provides a straightforward parallel to the cathedral south frieze: a plain stringcourse with small shields either end, and a large central shield, with a frieze above that is strongly reminiscent of the south frieze in Winchester Cathedral. The Lisle tomb frieze is very similar to the north frieze in the cathedral. However, at Thruxton the whole scheme is more complex and evolved, with the inclusion of a whole sequence of mouldings between arch head and frieze (fig. 163). In neither case is there a cornice. On the church tower at Thruxton can be seen the stringcourse and frieze that once capped the chapel walls that the Lisles had built to enclose their tomb. The stringcourse, which bears a plaque with the date of 1527, has the same small shields that we see in the cathedral and on the Pexall monument.

As we have seen, Prior Draper's chapel screen was created, or completed, in 1529 while the cathedral screens carry a date of 1525. The Lisle tomb may well have been designed before 1524. Mary Lisle mentions in her will that her husband had reached an agreement for their tomb to be made to the '... plot and bargain ... wt my lorde of Wynchestres mason ...'.[13] The Lisles both died in 1524. Edith Pexall died in 1519. It is possible that her husband, Ralph Pexall (d. 1540), commissioned Thomas Bertie to design and build the monument and chapel at Sherborne St John in a style that parallels that of the cathedral south presbytery screen not long after Edith Pexall died. As we will see, the cathedral south screen can be considered as earlier than the cathedral north screen. The work for the Lisles at Thruxton, created in the mid 1520s, mirrors the style of the presbytery north screen. I have therefore taken this as the chronology to be followed here, but it has to be said that there is no reason to suppose that the Pexall chantry could not be dated until after the work for the Lisles was completed; Sir Ralph Pexall himself not dying until 1540.[14]

There is a strong design theme that runs throughout these works and it may be that Thomas Bertie created a general design early in the 1520s, one that included the two main frieze layouts, based on incorporating elements of Gothic work – especially fenestration – which was then decorated with *all'antica* work (fig. 194). It is

12 This is discussed below in Chapter 14.

13 Will of Mary Lisle PROB 11/21 [PCC, 27 Bodfelde]. The Lisle and Pexall tombs are the central focus of the nest chapter.

14 VCH 3, 1908, detail from family tree shown on p. 213; and see VCH 4, 1911, 166.

a pity that the chapel at Thruxton has been destroyed and that for the Pexalls at Sherborne-St John modified in the nineteenth century otherwise we might then have a clearer idea of Bertie's overall architectural pretensions in the 1520s. Nonetheless, his screen at Christchurch quite possibly epitomises his intentions in the cathedral and it is with this screen mind that we should examine the cathedral work.

Winchester Cathedral - the presbytery arcade

The arcade of windows in the presbytery screens echoes the style of Fox's chantry chapel, (fig.s 42, 165 and 166) and, if to a lesser extent, the exterior windows flanking the presbytery aisles (fig. 40). While the latter are placed in symmetrical alignment, complete with their flying buttresses, the presbytery screen windows are irregularly placed; they do not fully fit the spaces between the piers and there are unequal stretches of infilling between window tracery and piers. It seems as if these windows were not made-to-measure, to fit between the presbytery piers, but why not if this was an intentional programme of work? Although these windows are somewhat different to the presbytery aisle windows in the details of their tracery, is it conceivable that they were originally intended for a refenestration of east walls of the transepts? Would this explain why the two doors into the presbytery are quite different, although the north door does have a window frame that has been cut down and fitted it (fig. 167)? The same problem can be observed with the friezes, neither precisely fits its setting. Is this part of the explanation for the diversity of the presbytery screens? Far from being an integrated piece of work, were the screens actually a hotchpotch, an *ad hoc* solution that brought together pre-existing pieces to which was added some new work? Or were they always intended to be brought together, but the project itself out-lived its original sponsors and was completed, as best they were able, by executors and succeeding cathedral officials, including the prior Henry Broke and perhaps also amongst John Avington?[15]

I shall now describe the work on the presbytery screens in what was probably the chronological sequence of work: the tombs, the arcade of windows, the

15 Avington was in the 1520s officiating in Fox's chantry chapel and commissioned an important triptych that includes Renaissance detail. He and the painting are discussed above in Chapter 4.

south frieze and the north frieze with these questions in mind and see if it possible to elucidate some answers.

Tombs beneath the presbytery screen

As Biddle described,[16] seven tombs lay in the path of the new presbytery screens: three on the south and four on the north. Those on the south (figs 168 and 170) were rehoused with stonework that echoed the style of Fox's chantry chapel, apart from the inclusion of Renaissance motifs in the spandrels of the new tombs (figs 169 and 171).[17] The burials on the north were re-interred in tombs fronted by panels that were covered with Renaissance decoration. This contrast is echoed by the choice of lettering style: on the south, a developed Gothic script (figs 168 and 170), while on the north a classical Roman serif was employed (fig. 172). This, as we shall see, was echoed in the choice of script applied to the presbytery screen stringcourses (figs 160 and 161).

The four burials set along the line of the north presbytery screen are, from the west, those of: Richard Toclyve (bishop 1173-88)[18], John of Pontoise (bishop 1282-1304), Aymer de Valence (bishop 1250-60) and King Harthacnut (ruled 1040-42) (figs 172-181). Of these, only Pontoise's tomb projects through both faces of the screen, and has panels either side (fig. 159). All these tombs conform to a basic layout of three panels set within square mouldings, the central panel is rectangular with an inscription recording details of the burial, and has square panels either side (see for example fig. 179). Pontoise's tomb was additionally provided with pilaster set between each of the larger panels (figs 174 and 175). The tombs of Harthacnut and Aymer de Valence have a central panel with an inscription on a plaque set within cartouches (figs 176-179) but the outer panels were provided with shields that are devoid of Renaissance motifs. Examined more closely, it is clear that the cartouches were based on foliate forms that are present in both the St Cross and Silkstede's

16 *Ibid.* 264-7.

17 There are three burials here, all in bay S2 S. In one tomb together were buried Earl Beorn and Richard, son of William the Conqueror; just to the west was buried the heart of Bishop Nicholas of Ely (bishop 1268-80).

18 Toclyve was also known as Richard of Ilchester, he succeeded to the see in succession to Henry de Blois (bishop 1129-71) who is buried at the east end of the quire.

friezes, the three-pointed leaf with berry (?) that is set at the top and bottom on Harthacnut's tomb a particularly close example (fig. 179). The same forms re-appear amongst the work on the East Anglian tombs, and we may note especially the contemporary work at Layer Marney where the dolphins, set as acroteria along the top of the tomb canopy, are treated with the same foliate forms.[19]

The tombs for Toclyve and Pontoise offer a more developed approach, with the latter somewhat more complex. Toclyve's tomb has a central panel bearing an inscription set within a deeply rebated frame with cartouches top and bottom and the whole suspended from a heavily ribbed ribbon (fig. 173). Either side are a pair of shields, that to the left bearing the arms of the see,[20] while that on the right has the date 1189, the year of Toclyve's death. The shields are surrounded by rinceaux formed from a rambling plant – perhaps a vine – that terminates in pods or bunches of what would appear to be a fruit, although a flower head is possible. The carver evidently struggled with the symmetry, we may note the differences between the rinceaux in the bottom corners of the two panels, and he was unable to fully integrate the geometry of the shields with the curvilinear sprawl of the rinceaux. The diagonal lines suggested by the rinceaux, for example, clearly do not march with the placement of the shields. Further, the symmetry from top to bottom is not a mirror of the left and right sides which the overall pattern of the rinceaux suggests was the original intention.

The ribbons appear in the St Cross work, if less overtly obvious, as do the floral forms used for the cartouches either end of the shields, otherwise these panels represent some movement into new stylistic grounds. The style of the ribbons is also to be seen in the terracotta panel at Hampton Court bearing Cardinal Wolsey's arms, and which may well have been created around the same time as Maiano's terracotta medallions and would therefore date to *c.*1520. They appear also in the assemblage

19 Pers. obs; on these tombs see Baggs 1968, which remains the only reliable if brief guide to these tombs. The recent discussion in Blatchly 2002 is littered with errors and misconceptions.

20 It is one of the curiosities of the early sixteenth century work in the cathedral that almost every example of the depiction of the arms of the see is different in some detail or another, ranging from the obvious reversal, so that sometimes the sword crosses from bottom right to top left and on others it is *vice versa*, to the finer detail of the treatment of the keys and the hilts of the swords. It seems evident that at this date there was no hard and fast design to which the see arms always conformed.

of motifs applied to the terracotta tombs at Oxburgh and Wymondham, again associated with plaques.[21] The rather spiky form of rinceaux echoes the treatment of the panels in Silkstede's frieze (figs 146-149) and this can also be seen to in bay S3 S of the south frieze (fig. 186). Does this represent a stylistic progression? It seems quite possible that if we regard the work here as the product of one workshop, then the development of the rinceaux that we can see in the tomb panels is what we might expect if this workshop was moving forward in developing its own style, and which was discovering ways and means of expressing new found motifs in differing ways.

These connections and developments are reinforced by the treatment of the panels of Pontoise's tomb (figs 174, 175, 180 and 181). The larger panels of this tomb are separated by narrow, rectangular panels each of which contains a form of candelabra that parallels those seen on the pilasters in Silkstede's stalls (fig.s 150-153). The central panel on the north face is framed on all four sides by foliate cartouches (fig. 181). This is surrounded by a particularly cramped and crowded rinceaux which, at the diagonal points, is punctuated by urns from which emerge a motif that is probably best interpreted as flames, although a foliate motif is a possibility. The thick stemmed rinceaux parallel those seen in the panels of Silkstede's stalls, although the general style marches with the work on Toclyve's tomb (figs 172 and 173). The panels either side, with shields that are now bare of either decoration or device, are clearly based on the central panel and demonstrate a simpler, more open rinceaux although again, as we observed with Toclyve's tomb, there are errors in the execution of the carving. The top corners of the left shield panel differ but, by far the strangest aspect of the work is the placement of the urns in the other two panels, which obviously defeated the carver who was completely unable to reconcile the differences of geometry (fig. 181). The treatment of the panels on the south side of the tomb is similar to that of the north with the exception of the central panel. This panel had a painted inscription though this is now much faded. The panel is the much the same as that provided for Toclyve's tomb, having a deeply rebated panel with foliate cartouches and is suspended from ribbons with terminal tassels. The adjoining panels again have shields surrounded by thick, fleshy rinceaux

21 Pers. obs.

complete with urns and floral motifs. The shield on the left is an especially extravagant example, although one wonders if it is upside down.

The pilasters on Pontoise's tomb are all slightly different, one from the next, apart from the two end pilasters on the north side which are almost identical (figs 180 and 181). Each is capped by a calyx-form vase containing a flower or floral or foliate motif while, beneath each, is a range of motifs and forms that echo the work on the pilasters in Silkstede's stalls. Of particular interest amongst the pilasters are the flower forms, or palmettes, present in pilasters 1,3 and 4 and the volutes in the pilasters 1,2 and 4 on the north side of the tomb as these motifs are taken onwards into the designs for the north frieze set above the tomb.

Apart from the use of the cartouches, and the application of classical forms to the angularity of the tomb panels and the deeply rebated, square mouldings, the tombs can be seen as a development and re-use of an assemblage of motifs that had been applied previously to both the St Cross and Silkstede friezes and associated woodwork. Biddle saw the cartouches as 'advanced for 1525 ...' and saw them as forerunners of the leathery scrolls we would now associate with Fontainebleau in the 1530s and 1540s.[22] I suggest that we can reject this interpretation in the light of the connections now demonstrated between the tomb panels and the St Cross and Silkstede friezes. There is no case, in my view, to argue for a forerunner of a style that was yet to fully emerge in France and which, clearly, can be seen in other contemporary work such as the plaques to be seen applied to the decoration of the terracotta tombs in East Anglia.

The north door through the presbytery screen

In a chronologically logical sequence, the reconstruction of the tombs should have been followed by the creation or erection of the doors, and next by the insertion of the arcades of windows with attendant stonework for the screens, followed by the laying of the string-courses and then the friezes. The south door, with its flamboyant

22 Biddle 1993, 267.

Gothic styling and detail,[23] must be a retention from earlier work or moved here from another part of the cathedral. Nonetheless, we should beware of such an interpretation if we follow the French model where, very obviously, the final phases of Gothic-styled work were being created alongside work carrying Renaissance motifs. Thus for example the work at the church of St Maclou in Rouen which was being remodelled at the same time as was the château at Gaillon, which too was also essentially a Gothic work if heavily embellished and partially remodelled with Italianate decorative elements.

The north door shows the amalgamation of Gothic style with Renaissance decorative motifs. It is set in the eastern half of Bay N1 and has set above it elements of tracery and fenestration that march with the arcades of windows in the screen (fig. 182). The doorway comprises a two-leaf door with a surround of jamb and lintel which, on the north face, is covered in Renaissance decoration, and with a crenellated cornice above (figs 183 and 184). The south face is plain. On the north face, the cornice, jamb and spandrels are covered with repeating candelabra that essentially derives from floral rinceaux, but which here is characterised particularly by the use of slashed volutes with terminal ball forms (fig. 183).

The physical presence of a line through the candelabra is downplayed in this exposition of the style and, along the lintel, is absent with, in its stead, a four-petalled flower (fig. 183).[24] The spandrels contain a shield each bearing a letter: to the left H and the right B, these presumably for Henry Broke, who was prior of St Swithun's 1524-36 (fig. 184).[25] Projecting from the shields into the point of the spandrels are motifs that parallel those we have seen applied to the tombs. To the left, an urn from which emerges a calyx form with a floral extension and, to the right, a possible flower head with a pair of slashed volutes, with inturned ball terminals,

[23] Although note the internal crocketed spire has been decapitated and fitted with a pair of winged angels supporting a shield with the royal arms. This is the only such example of full length angel supporters, elsewhere angels are seen with a shield clasped in front of them so that all we see is their hands and faces peering over the rim while half-length angels appear in the frieze over the altar in Fox's chantry chapel.

[24] This cannot of course be a rose as this would have five petals and, where it is displayed as Tudor rose it would have at least two layers of petals.

[25] A shield with the letters H B and, below these, the letter P (for prior) is set on the north screen string-course in bay N2 N, which would tend to confirm the identification of Henry Broke.

either side of its stem. This treatment of the spandrels would be echoed in Thomas Bertie's work on the Pexall, Lisle and Norton monuments and can be seen as a characteristic of his workshop style. The particular style of these volutes provides a clear linking motif that appears on the tombs and again on the frieze above. Blunt looked at this door and suggested that this too offered parallels with French work but named no sites for comparison. My own observations are that it is very apparent that this form of candelabra or rinceaux does not appear in any extant work at Gaillon or in Rouen.[26] The style of this door is replicated in the jambs of the Lisle tomb, which was probably carved between 1524 and 1527.

The north door extends the vocabulary of motifs applied to the presbytery works and, with its linking elements, provides a further example that shows how the whole is linked by its parts. The inclusion of the initials HB, and we may note again the use of experimental display scripts, which, if identified as those of Henry Broke tell us that the door would not have been erected (or should we say completed, as there is nothing to say that Broke did not 'inherit' the work from Silkstede) before 1524.

Experimental display scripts

In this and previous chapters, reference has been made to the variety of script forms that appear throughout the programme of work executed in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. At the beginning of the century it would certainly seem to be the case that one of the forms of black-letter script held sway and was always used in publicly displayed scripts.[27] In the quarter century that follows, this script is superseded by a series of experimental scripts alongside extrovert renderings of initial letters, such as those of Langton and Silkstede in the Lady Chapel (fig. 49). This change is most particularly seen in its application to the mottos set around the depictions of the Order of the Garter where, in the 1500s this is shown in black-letter, in the 1510s it is executed in a range of developed, classicised scripts until by the

26 Blunt 1969, 22.

27 Robert Sherburne's work at St Cross, executed before 1504 when his Mastership ended following his translation to St David's, included the provision of glass and fireplaces which are marked with his name and motto in black-letter script.

1530s it is rendered in a Roman type, usually with a serif, such as the Garter mottoes shown on Gardiner's tomb. The stringcourses on the south screens show the motto, displayed repetitively on either face, *Est Deo Gracia,*[28] with this rendered in a cursive decorative script that seems to be based on twelfth century Romanesque originals, such as Henry de Blois' *Winchester Bible* (figs 185 and 186).[29]

The date of 1525 is rendered in Arabic numerals on both series of string-courses, (figs 186 and 187). This is in an acute style that can be seen on prints and paintings of the period, such as those of Dürer and Holbein,[30] and can also be seen on contemporary painted glass such as the windows in the south transept of Rouen cathedral and glass now installed in the church of St Jeanne d'Arc, in the Vieux Marché.[31] The mottoes on the north side of the presbytery are given in two styles: those on the south face closely similar, but not identical to, the script on the south screen, while on the north face the lettering is rendered in a Classical Roman script with a nominal serif (fig. 188).[32]

The use of these varying display scripts, and especially the changing script used with the rendition of the mottoes around displays of the Garter, sheds further light on changing fashions in contemporary style that parallels and echoes the introduction and use of Renaissance motifs. In the case of the Garter motto, there was a steady move towards replacing the later medieval use of black-letter script with a fully Classical Roman letter form (fig. 189). The move from the one to the other matches the change in use of Gothic vegetive forms alongside crockets and finials to sharper, geometric forms covered with new shapes and geometric forms. From this we can see that changes in decorative styles were paralleled by the use and introduction of new styles of script, and is further evidence also for patronal interest in a wide-ranging change in attitude to fashionable décor and style.

28 The motto is translated by Biddle as 'God is Grace' or 'Grace is an attribute of God'. I do not accept this and suggest that 'By the Grace of God' or 'It is God's Grace' would be a more apt rendition given the facts of Fox's career which would presumably have informed his choice of motto; and see further above in Chapter 4.

29 On the Winchester Bible, see Donovan 1993.

30 For the graphic style of inscribing dates on German Renaissance prints, see Bartrum 1995.

31 Pers. obs.

32 The mottoes on the north screen are *In Domino Confido* ('I trust in the Lord') and *Sit Laus* ('Praise be to God'); on these mottoes, see Biddle 1993, 270-1.

Renaissance friezes on the presbytery screens.

There are two friezes: the south and the north, and these are quite different in style although both have the same general form.[33] The friezes comprise long, rectangular sections of carved work in stone that are framed beneath and at each ends by a deeply rebated square moulding (figs 165, 166, and 185-188). The top surface, which may have been left unfinished, has a ragged appearance.

These friezes have also been extensively described and discussed by Biddle, and it is again not my intention to replicate his work here.[34] That said, there are number of points with which I wish to take issue, not the least of which is the integration of the north frieze with other pieces of work in the north screen and, also, the connections between these pieces and work elsewhere which Biddle does not enlarge upon. There is also to be considered the curious omission by Biddle of any comment on the iconography of the friezes.

I mentioned above that there has been a tendency to see the friezes as being architecturally incorrect. However, as I have shown, by examining the cathedral work in the context of the wider group of work we can see that this was in fact a deliberately stated architectural arrangement. In particularizing this aspect of the presbytery work, it is my intention to show the possibility that the wrong rod of assize has been used and that there has been a failure to recognise that the introduction of Renaissance decorative ideas brought with it experimentation with architectural form and setting. Thus it is that we say that architecturally the cathedral friezes are incorrect but did *they* who made these pieces see it this way? Were *they* concerned with achieving a purity or accuracy of grammar, when *their* intent may well have been to introduce pieces of work more for their effect and impact than for their aesthetics or the purity of expression of classical architectural grammar? In a sense this encapsulates the problem facing an English-trained mason

33 Biddle 1993, 270-2, makes much of the differences between frieze and screens, remarking that the north screen makes 'more of the Franco-Italian style of decoration' than does the south screen. The screens themselves are clearly Gothic and what Biddle is really saying is that the new style is intruded much more heavily in the north arcades than the south because of the treatment to tombs and door.

34 *Ibid.*, 271-74.

such as Thomas Bertie. He would have been trained to work with Gothic designs thus the introduction of *all'antica* ornament would have been both entirely novel and quite probably also entirely divorced from any understanding of the principles or ideas of classical ornament. There is no suggestion that Thomas Bertie ever left England and saw for himself Classical architecture; moreover, it is far from certain as to just what he might have seen in the form of prints or other material upon which he would have been able to construct any classical designs for his *all'antica* work. This in turn would inevitably mean that Bertie's constructs would be inelegant – and, arguably, poorly informed - in terms of their architectural pretensions as far as the purist would be concerned, but would nonetheless provide an answer to fashionable aspirations, that is (or was) to create a monument dressed in up to the moment, latest fashionable taste.

If we look closely at the friezes, we can see that they are apparently not fully integrated with their settings. There are three aspects that underpin this judgement: the heraldic devices applied to the string-courses, the presence of the mouldings around the frieze and the jointing of individual sections of frieze. As we shall see, this evidence is in fact potentially misleading - the stringcourses and friezes above were in fact almost certainly created contemporaneously and to an intentional design.

The shields on the stringcourses

The screens are marked by the provision of a range of heraldic devices. Some of these are carved onto small shields that are contained within the width of the stringcourses, such as the shield showing Fox's arms as bishop of Exeter in bay S1 S (fig.185). There are intervening floral motifs, set between each rendition of the mottoes, which are more in keeping with traditional Gothic motifs rather than in tune with Renaissance work that, in the context of these pieces, is somewhat surprising.[35] At each centre-point of each bay is a larger heraldic device. These

35 The motifs on the string courses echo the bosses in the north and south presbytery aisle vaults and, additionally, the bosses in the wooden vault over the presbytery although here many of these floral or foliate motifs (many are of the 'cabbage-leaf' type) were overlaid by heraldic bosses.

project from the string-course upwards to obscure the carved work of the frieze above (fig.s 165, 166 and see 185 and 187).

The range and style of these devices is such that it is possible they were not part of the original work but were attached later. This observation is lent some weight by the differences in execution of the episcopal arms, and in the font-style used for the lettering of the Garter motto, for example see the shield in bay S3 S (fig. 186), which has a further variant of development scripts. The shield in S2 N has a classic Roman font, while another in bay N2 S which has yet another font (note the *Honi* incorrectly rendered as *Hoi*) (fig. 189). The shields on the north bays are encircled with frames that are in a Renaissance style and similar to those which we usually associate with medallions such as at St Cross. Thus, in bay N1 S, the ring of the frame is slashed (fig. 187) while in bay N2 N, the frame contains a candelabra with floral motifs (perhaps a fruit of some description). Were some of these shields added later? Did they form part of the original design? Biddle commented on the '... awkwardness of the fit between the southern screen and the frieze ...' above.[36] However, this design element of projecting the major shields up into the field of the frieze above is a feature of both the Pexall and the Lisle tombs, albeit in both cases the frieze does not run behind the shields as it does in the cathedral, thus it may have either been an intentional part of the programme or one that evolved as the project developed.

Mouldings framing the friezes

The mouldings which frame the friezes would, we might suppose, be expected to be a consistent feature of these pieces; that they are not requires some explanation. The diagram in figure 191 shows where the mouldings are complete, and where the end of each section of frieze is not enclosed by a moulding frame. Does the fact that the end vertical moulding is absent in several places carry with it the implication that these sections have been cut back in order to obtain a fit within the bays to which they have been applied?

36 Biddle 1993, 272.

The problem can be seen even more emphatically in how individual sections of frieze are butted together. The south frieze presents a fluid design of carved work that is largely uninterrupted,[37] however this is not the case with the north frieze. Here all the sections of frieze are worked to the centre of each bay, so that the fluency of the frieze carving is broken at each mid point because a section of frieze has been cut off in order to create symmetry either side of the centre-point. In order to achieve this, the vase with flowers supported by affronted volutes has been removed bringing closer together the urn with ears of grain. This can seen in bay N1 N, where the episcopal shield with its Renaissance-styled frame is set between two urns with ears of grain which are noticeably closer together here than they are further along the frieze (fig. 188). And here a possible reason for the larger heraldic devices at the centre of each bay perhaps becomes explicable; the shields were deliberately placed to obscure the fact that the north frieze does not fit and that part of the frieze decoration is missing. Notwithstanding that the same design appears in the Pexall and Lisle tombs, does this leave a possibility that at Winchester the overall design was not thought through or that here we have, as Biddle suggests, an *ad hoc* solution that brought together a collection of pre-existing pieces and placed them together in a single, uncoordinated work? It is interesting to note that in the Pexall monument the mouldings around the frieze are also open-ended or absent and it may be that we are seeing too much of significance in this feature. The problem can be aired further when we have looked at the friezes themselves.

The south frieze

The south frieze is decorated with a repetitive scheme of motifs that are arranged like a rinceaux, with a series of tightly curled cornucopia emerging from slashed volutes looped around and into a central urn forming the lower half of the design (figs 185 and 186). Set between and above each pair of rings are, in a repeating sequence: a blank shield, an urn and a winged putto head: this sequence forms design 1. This sequence is repeated a second time either side of the centre-point of

37 Biddle 1993, 272 points out that there are nonetheless some minor jointing misfits in the south frieze.

each bay where the rhythm is changed. Here the shields are replaced with a pelican vulning. The pattern is then repeated for the second part of the bay, so that each bay is symmetrical about its centre point. There are variations to this pattern on the north face of the south frieze. In bay S1 N the sequence probably had to be changed to allow for the presence of the bishop's throne, so that the central shield is placed off-centre and partially obscures the left-hand pelican. Rather curiously, further to the left (east) of this section the pattern breaks down and a shield is missing with a putto head in its stead (fig. 193). Is this a mistake? This feature re-appears in bay S2 N (fig. 194) although in the next bay the general sequence is followed. There are minor differences of treatment to each section of frieze and individual elements do not follow a consistent theme; thus, the putto heads vary slightly one from the next, as does the surface decoration and overall form of the urns. It is probably unlikely that this was intended to convey an emphatic difference but represents, quite probably, the designer's and carver's whim to incorporate an element of diversity into a scheme that is otherwise repetitive.

Bay S3 S (fig. 186) offers a variation of this theme, design 2, in what amounts to a design change. The shields and putto heads are removed (apart from one putto's head, this is the penultimate motif eastwards, which remains); also removed are the slashed volutes, to be replaced by cornucopia that are drawn out into spiky extensions, described lyre-fashion around a urn, that end in foliate forms and which curl round into a rose and pomegranate. These floral motifs are echoed by a shield on the string-course where the two motifs are displayed dimidiated together. A further lidded urn – complete with further 'spiky' extensions and curling around both rose and pomegranate – is set between each full motif. Just to the right (east) of the centre-point of bay S3 S appear the letters RW for *Ricardus Wintonia* (fig. 186), with Fox's own pelican device set just above. This is the only instance of Fox's episcopal initials to appear on the frieze. The treatment of the urn just to the right (west) of the pelican is repeated on the other face, S3 N, of this section of frieze.

This variation of style offers a connecting link between the south frieze and the work on the tomb panels and frieze in the north screen revealing, however discretely, an observable trail of workmanship that leads us from the Silkstede woodwork through the tombs in the north frieze and then on into the work in the

south frieze. Particularly noticeable is the use of thick stemmed, 'spiky', branched rinceaux with terminal leaves executed in a particular manner.

The north frieze

Just as at St Cross, where the design sequences differ from the north screen to the south (and with a further arrangement for the west face), the two cathedral friezes offer different patterns and styles – although in the cathedral setting the differences are more emphatic. Was this a deliberate design choice? The experience of the St Cross frieze suggests it might have been. The staccato, tightly-wound, rinceaux of the cathedral south frieze is replaced in the north frieze with a more curvilinear, elongated and softer pattern of motifs that are uncrowded and set spaciously, with far more of the field left blank than is the case in the south frieze (figs 187 and 188). The same basic design idea is followed. A double series of urns was incorporated amongst floral and volute rinceaux, with these decorated with further floral motifs (fig. 187). The basic design shows a tall urn (or chalice?) that contains flowers and fruits and which are supported by a pair of linked and affronted slashed volutes. These volutes are the geometric equivalent of the dolphin volutes seen in the St Cross frieze, the ball terminals of which are linked together here around the base of the second urn, a shorter vessel from which emerges a five-branched floral motif or palmette. The main design provides for five pairs of urns either side of the centre-point in each bay of the frieze, where the taller of the two urns has been removed to allow the lengths of frieze to provide a symmetrical, mirror-image, appearance either side of the centre (fig. 187). The basic layout, which I designate here as design 3 (with designs 1 and 2 in the south frieze), can be seen in bay N1 S (fig. 187 and see figs 193 and 194).[38]

[38] I have suggested that design 3 forms the basic design in the north frieze with variations thereof forming new designs based on design 3. It could be argued that design 4, which occurs more often in the frieze, should be seen as the base design and that the variations are based on design 4. Either way, the end effect is that there are four designs all of which are clearly based on the same design idea.

Biddle observed that there were '...small variations between the various elements of the north frieze.'[39] Close examination shows that these variations are sufficiently different to warrant, in my view, a specific label as a design change. The first of these variations, design 4, is to be seen in bays N2 S, N3 S and N2 N (see fig. 159 for the distribution of the frieze designs). The overall design remains unchanged but the treatment to the volutes, where they meet beneath the taller urn, is reworked to elevate the affronted ends of these motifs and make them much more 'pointy', almost beak-like in their character (figs 193 and 196). This is matched with a consequent change to the treatment of the bodies of the volutes; there is now slightly less floral cladding and the upper leaves are more curvaceous. Second, the fruits hanging from the taller vases are changed; these are shown dangling more deeply than in the first design.[40]

The next design, D5, provides a more detailed carving of the previous designs (fig. 193 and 197); here the 'flares' that can be seen around the foliate heads emerging from the shorter urns are filled out with ears of corn or wheat; the flower heads in this sequence have however been reverted to those that appear in design 3. The last design change, D6, is only to be seen in a single short fragment that is set on the east end of bay N1 N (fig. 193). Here a taller urn may be seen, containing a mound of fruit and with supported by extravagantly displayed volutes either side. This is an altogether bolder and more effusive design.

Iconography

The friezes and string-courses are filled with a range of iconography that recalls, in heraldic form, Richard Fox's episcopal life and the royal house of Tudor he served so faithfully for much of his life. This is particularly noticeable on the south screens where Fox's arms predominate, and where his pelican device has an occasional perch. The roses and pomegranates in bay S3 S recall in particular Fox's absolutely

39 Biddle 1993, 272.

40 Interpreting the origin of these motifs is usually difficult and here the more so as the motifs have been stripped of their naturalistic allusions and replaced with geometrical fantasy. The volutes could easily be based on a pair of birds, perhaps peacocks, drinking from an urn or vase.

commitment and loyalty to Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon (fig. 186). It is a pity that the shields in the south frieze are plain but were they always so? We can of course now never know, and it would be pointless to speculate in detail, as the possibilities are very considerable. We can point to other schemes with which Fox was involved and, from these, infer that there was quite probably an original intent that these shields would have borne a charge and that, in the context in which the frieze is set, this would most likely have carried a religious connotation, such as symbols of the Passion. There is no reason to suppose that they would not have been heraldic and simply have been charged with Fox's pelican device badge. Symbols of the Passion do appear on the north screen: a shield on the string-course has a sword slicing off Malchus's ear in bay N1N (fig. 198) while a central, larger shield, has the five wounds (the nailed hands and feet and the heart). Were these intended to be part of another sequence of the symbols of the Passion, echoing and paralleling the displays of these symbols in the presbytery vault and in a frieze set above the altar in Fox's chantry chapel? The shields in the south frieze are quite small, as are those in Fox's chantry chapel (fig. 51), which would suggest a relatively simple feature rather than complex heraldic or religious symbolism.

The urns that appear in both of the friezes are more readily explicable and can be seen as a reference to the Eucharist. This is more readily seen in the north frieze, where the presence of ears of wheat carry the implication of a reference to bread, while the potential bunches of grapes imply a reference to wine. The cornucopia that appear in the south frieze might, by their presence, carry the suggestion of a thank offering in the sense of the horn of plenty and the cup overflowing, thus the urn. We should however recognise that both motifs are common in Renaissance designs, and indeed in designs applied also to temporal architectural schemes, and it may well be mistaken to place an overtly religious significance upon them. Nevertheless, given the setting, the pronounced appearance of the ears of wheat in the north frieze, with their unmistakable significance, probably offers a clear pointer to just what the patron, designer and craftsman had in mind when the frieze was created. Therefore we should see the frieze as an affirmation of belief, with specific reference to the Passion and the Eucharist; this too is a reflection of its setting.

The tightness of the designs and the limitations of the range of motifs employed in these friezes is in itself interesting. This was no effort of prodigy, unlike the St Cross frieze or its French antecedents at Gaillon. There are no portrait medallions, no fantastic creatures – although dolphins or birds could easily have been incorporated into the north frieze in place on the anamorphic volutes – and no sense of fantasy but rather an interpretation of style. There was, it seems, no intention to create a fabulous setting, but instead an ambition to send a clear message alongside expressions of patronage and loyalty: thus the use of motifs clearly to be associated with the Eucharist alongside patronal images, the heraldic shields and mottoes that were clear enough to contemporaries, even if the full illusion escapes us today.

Chronology and questions of patronage

The inclusion of the north door with panels bearing the initials of Henry Broke,[41] who was prior in succession to Thomas Silkstede from 1524, suggests the date 1525, which can be seen inscribed on both sets of string-courses, alludes, perhaps, to the completion of the work here. The death of Richard Fox in 1528 offers another closing date for the work, but when did it begin? It seems unlikely that work on the arcades of windows in the presbytery screens would have been contemplated before construction of Fox's chantry chapel had been completed with this documented as having occurred by December 1518.[42] Work on the presbytery would therefore seem to have taken place in the first half of the 1520s, perhaps starting as early as 1520 and certainly underway before 1524 when the Lisle tomb, with its frieze that parallels the cathedral north frieze, was commissioned.

The presbytery screens were therefore most likely to have been developed in the following sequence. The south door was either retained from a pre-existing scheme or brought here from another part of the cathedral. The south tombs were probably the first work, with these deliberately echoing the work on Fox's chantry chapel. Were the tombs in the north screen the next element or were these intruded

41 A shield with Broke's initials is set on bay N2 N (fig. 196).

42 Smith 1988, 27, citing an inventory of that date.

into the screen later in this campaign of work? This seems unlikely, thus I suggest these tombs with their striking decorative parallels to the Silkstede frieze were the next element in the series. Next, the arcades of fenestration were erected. The string-courses and friezes were then added onto these. Only the north face of the north door is worked, why not the south face? Does this represent a modification or was this original work? There is no especial reason to suppose this door could not have been inserted into an already existing arcade, put in as a replacement for another, earlier door that matched the south door. That said, the character of the *all'antica* work on the door jams and in the spandrels also appears in the work on the Lisle monument, where the quality of the work appears to be more evolved and complex than that in the cathedral. This would tend to suggest that the north door predates the Lisle monument, therefore I would argue that, probably, the north door was created before 1524 and only completed at or soon after that date, when Prior Broke's initials were added to mark his involvement in the work. A further possible solution, explaining why only the north side of this door is carved, is that after years of chaos in the presbytery the new prior intervened and brought the work here to a swift conclusion.

The unfinished and unfitting nature of the friezes, quite apart from what is construed to be their ungrammatical appearance, leaves us in some doubt as to their original purpose. Were they really intended to serve the purpose for which they were used? We have no idea when each was carved, beyond the timescales of the patrons associated with them. It is possible that Fox commissioned the south frieze for his own purposes, it does carry his pelican device, but not for this setting. If we look at the Pole chantry chapel at Christchurch priory (fig. 198), we can see another essay in Gothic architecture, but one where Renaissance decorative motifs have been set into the panels and pilasters of the work. Might Fox have contemplated a similar treatment to his own chantry? Were the sections of frieze in the south screen originally intended to form part of Fox's chantry? It is quite evident that this was not quite as improbable as might be supposed when we consider the style of Draper's chantry in Christchurch priory, where elements of the style of the north frieze were harmoniously incorporated into a setting that has Gothic-styled windows.

The south frieze, if this was the first of the two, may not have been intended for the cathedral at all. It is possible that its original intended location could have been the chancel at St Cross, providing a back-drop to the stall-work and frieze that was erected there. An alternative location within the cathedral might have been to provide an arcade of windows capped with a frieze across the interior of the north transept, a matching arcade for windows that were intended to fill the exterior wall here, a project that was begun in the late 1510s but, as I described above, was apparently abandoned in favour of a greater commitment to the work on Corpus Christi college in Oxford. Such an arcade would have paralleled the work at Fécamp (figs 8 and 9).

It may be that Fox was not directly associated with the north screen frieze; there is no reference to him here, only to his associates: Broke the prior of St Swithun's and Frost his steward (they are both referred to through shields on the stringcourse, see figs 196 and 197).[43] It may however be observed that these references occur on the string-course – not on the frieze itself although an owl can be seen perched on a vase in bay N2S, which might allude to Frost – and this rather leaves the actual patronage of the frieze itself open to enquiry if, as seems possible, the friezes were both sections of material remaining from an abandoned project. We should perhaps not ignore the possible association of John Avington with these works. He was the priory's clerk of works during the 1520s and, as we have seen, he was another enthusiast for Italianate styles. Was he left with the problem of completing a project, the introduction of arcades of windows to serve as presbytery screens, at a time when Fox's health was failing (we might note that some time before 1525 Fox had lost his sight), and also when Thomas Silkstede was coming to the end of his life too? Lacking the direct enthusiasm and financial resources of the bishop, it may well have been Avington's lot to do the best he could with disparate materials, creating a new set of screens that, ultimately, have a temporising, ill-conceived feel about them.

[43] Frost died in 1529 and was buried at Netley, his tomb, if ever one was built, would presumably have perished following the Reformation. An intriguing possibility is that the north frieze might have been carved as part of a projected monument for Frost.

Style

Much has been made of the differences of style between the two friezes and that there appears to be a Franco-Italian style to the south screen, over-wrought and with hot-house tendencies, compared to the cool, sparse, feel of the north screen with its seemingly purer classical style that appears to be more in keeping with Italian work than work transmitted through the prism of north-European craftsmanship.[44] As always, appearances can be deceptive and the case of the presbytery friezes is no exception. When we closely examine the frieze-work, pull it apart and analyse the collection of motifs we find that in fact almost all have previously been used in the St Cross frieze and many appeared in Silkstede's.

All the elements that appear on the tomb panels are drawn from the stylisation of the fantastic creatures in the St Cross frieze and simply re-used in a different context. The idea of so doing came, presumably, from book title-pages where such cartouches were a common feature. Richard Fox most likely had examples in his own library. We do not need to look forward to the style of Fontainebleau, or of the carved work of Goujon, for parallels or for intimations of a style that was not, in the 1520s, yet making its own first appearance in France.[45] Most significantly, the absence of any sense of flat scrollwork, the device and stylism that so defines Goujon's work and which, in a Winchester context would appear in mid-century in both Bishop Gardiner's and Thomas Mason's tombs,[46] rules out any notion that the tomb work should be contemplated alongside the Fontainebleau style.

Blunt saw the quality of the work as evidence for the possibility of French craftsmen working in Winchester who had previously worked in Rouen or Gaillon.[47] Biddle thought that this was to underestimate the ability of English craftsmen, citing work on the palace at the Field of Cloth of Gold as evidence for the capacity and

44 Biddle 1993, 274
45 *Ibid.*
46 These are described in Biddle 1993, 281-94.
47 Blunt 1969, 22.

ability of English craftsmen to execute work in Renaissance styles.[48] It is of interest to note that a not altogether dissimilar frieze to that on the north presbytery screen in the cathedral was added as a stringcourse above the windows of this temporary palace, although we should be aware that the detail may be inaccurate as this was not a contemporary record. The quality of the work on the tombs, and more noticeably so on Silkstede's frieze, is such that we can perhaps exclude a French craftsman although there is no reason, either way, to do so. As with so much else undertaken in the cathedral at this time, there is no documentation to support either dating or craftsmanship. Biddle did not offer much comment on the parallels to be drawn between the inclusion of motifs in Silkstede's stalls and their re-appearance amongst the motifs on the tomb panels, and he certainly did not see a common theme running through the work in the presbytery and emanating from the St Cross/Silkstede works.

Gaillon has been suggested as a source for the Renaissance work in the cathedral. Here, roughly similar cartouches can be seen, for on both D'Amboise's loggia and applied to D'Estouteville's stair tower are medallions with name plaques that have framing cartouches. The unusual five-branched motif that is a characteristic feature of the north frieze has a faint parallel where a less obvious motif is set in the rinceaux applied to the Porte des Gênes and to the west face of the entrance pavilion. The rinceaux are however a long way apart in both geometry and style. The French work a curvilinear, loosely wound and rotating design where a finely carved line linking individual motifs is a defining characteristic of their work. By contrast, the Winchester work, reduced to its basic geometrical form, is a staccato sequence of waves on the south frieze, while the north offers a re-definition of this wave so that it is smoother and flatter. Neither offer a fully curved line that swings through 360º, moreover the French work tends usually to be effected around, and supportive of, centralised objects or divided into sections or panels, rather than expressed as a continuous running ornament. The individual elements are to be found in French contexts, it would be surprising if they were not, although the naturalism of the ears of wheat in the north frieze would be an unlikely occurrence with the whole point of Renaissance craftsmanship being to translate reality into

[48] Biddle 1993, n. 96.

fantasy. We are nonetheless left with a geometric repetition. Are we in fact looking the wrong way? Should we not recollect that if this was the work of an English mason and an English team of carvers, then their training would have been in Gothic styles, where repetition and geometric accuracy to a metronomic standard was a pre-requisite?

If the presbytery screens were indeed the work of Thomas Bertie, then it is entirely feasible that he would have rendered the friezes in the same manner as a Gothic-styled crest for a chancel screen or chantry chapel but used instead a series of Renaissance motifs in place of Gothic crockets, spires and fleurs-de-lis. If we reduce the rinceaux on the friezes to their basic geometry this reveals that they are, at base, a Gothic frieze rendered in a new style.

The divergences of fit and general lack of cohesion between the friezes and the remainder of the work in the presbytery screens perhaps should be taken as indicative of a primary work. This then can be seen as Thomas Bertie's first substantial arrangement of architectural work carrying *all'antica* decoration. I believe we should see the dates of 1525 as being nothing more than a ceremonial date that marked the completion of what would have been a protracted and complex piece of work; one that was undertaken at the heart of the monks' place of worship with all the noise, disruption, mess and dirt that would have accompanied it. For Thomas Bertie, this was a step into the unknown, the introduction of a new fashion amidst an otherwise Gothic setting. It was something of an experiment, one that, perhaps fortunately for him, his patron and sponsor Bishop Richard Fox, could not have seen as by the time it was completed Fox was blind. The work in the cathedral was additionally a commercial success for Thomas Bertie, as it led to several further commissions: the tombs and chapels for the Pexalls and Lisles, a chapel for Draper and a monument for the Nortons. All of these pieces of work are absolutely derivative and comparable to the work in the cathedral, and it is to these we can now turn.

Chapter 13:

Thomas Bertie's work across Hampshire

THE STYLE OF THE WORK AT SHERBORNE ST JOHN and Thruxton can clearly be linked to that in the presbytery screens, and thus perhaps to a single workshop and, by extension, to one man – Bishop Richard Fox's mason – Thomas Bertie. This chapter sets out the evidence and explores the style of the work such that it is possible to substantiate this claim. There are three main sections following some introductory comments: the first describes the Pexall monument and other work at Sherborne St John, the second describes the Lisle monument at Thruxton, while the last section explores Bertie's later ecclesiastical monuments.

Bertie's all'antica *tomb-work.*

A central theme of this study has been to point out the scarcity of research into Renaissance work of the early Tudor period in central southern England. It was a surprise, as has been remarked upon above, to find that the frieze at St Cross was so poorly known, and never previously explored in detail prior to 1999. I have also noted that it was not until 1993 that Biddle undertook the first rigorous survey of the Renaissance material in the cathedral. It is even so somewhat astonishing to find yet another group of work that has evaded critical notice and analysis. While Prior Draper's chantry has received some attention, three further tombs – those at East Tisted, Sherborne St John and Thruxton – remain virtually anonymous.[1] The

[1] None of the churches with Renaissance tombs described here feature in Simon Jenkins's 1999, *England's Thousand Best Churches.* Pevsner's earlier survey provides very little detail, so much so that when first I saw the tomb at Sherborne St John I was literally stopped

description and discussion that follows takes the Pexall tomb at Sherborne St John and the Lisle tomb at Thruxton, both were set up in chapels that were probably also the result of Bertie's workmanship, as the main exemplars of Bertie's work outside the cathedral. But what of the men for whom these tombs were created? We know very little about Sir Ralph Pexall, while Sir John Lisle is somewhat better served in the documentary record.

Sir John Lisle (died *c.*1523/24)

At the beginning of the sixteenth century, there were no major baronial families in domiciled in Hampshire. The county was dominated, as it had been for several hundreds of years, by ecclesiastical figures and corporations. Foremost amongst these were the bishops of Winchester, the priory of St Swithun's (the cathedral) and the abbey of Hyde, with their lands set alongside substantial tracts of land held for the crown in demesne or as forest but there was in Hampshire no earl nor a major landholding by a duke. On the other hand there were many families of gentry: such as the Brocas, Frosts, Nortons, Lisles, Pauletts, Pexalls, Sandys, St Johns and so on whose fortunes and lands waxed and waned over the centuries. These families rarely rose to positions of great national prominence; almost exceptionally, Sandys and Paulett achieved such distinction and were ennobled later in the sixteenth century.

The Lisles were one such family of 'low-key' gentry. They quite possibly came to England with the Conqueror and were, by *c.*1130, closely associated with the Isle of Wight where '... they held seven and half fees of the earl of Devon by knight's service, castleguard, and suit at the knights' court.'[2] Through judicious marriages and adept service, the family had increased its holdings on the Isle of Wight by the early sixteenth century to an extent that gave them the title of Lisles of Wooton.[3] They had additionally garnered some further fifteen manors across Hampshire, principally Thruxton in the north-west of the county, which was close to the forest of

in my tracks with the surprise of seeing it there, knowing instantly what it was and its relationship to the tomb at Thruxton.

2 Hicks 2004.

3 The Lisle estate on the Isle of Wight is detailed manor by manor in VCH Hampshire, 5, 1912, 142, 143, 145, 155, 162, 172, 182, and 191.

Chute of which they were hereditary keepers, and South Baddesley in the New Forest.[4] They had also manors in Wiltshire, Dorset and Devon.[5] Although landed, the Lisles seem never to have built either a fortified house, or castle, nor has a major manor house been identified with them although they must have had houses of some size at Thruxton and Wooton, if not elsewhere.[6]

Details of Sir John Lisle's early life are now lost. His father was Sir Nicholas Lisle who died before 1506.[7] Sir John Lisle was knighted in 1503 at the same investiture when Prince Henry was created prince of Wales.[8] he next appears in 1506-07 when he was listed as sheriff of Hampshire.[9] In May 1509 he was listed as one of the knights listed in attendance at Westminster for the funeral of Henry VII,[10] and in July 1511, along with Richard Norton of East Tisted, and John Brocas of Beaurepaire, Lisle was listed as amongst those given commissions of array,[11] having previously been a commissioner of the peace every year from 1509.[12] It is in this military capacity that he appeared throughout the 1510s. He appears in 1512 and is listed in the retinue of Sir William Sandys; this was a muster in Hampshire of the array in preparation to resist a feared invasion of the south coast by the French.[13] In January 1513 we see Lisle again involved in military preparations, on this occasion probably because he was sheriff of the county of Hampshire.[14] He took part in the

4 Their lands in Hampshire are given in VCH, **3**, 1908, 484; and VCH **4**, 1911, 353, 373, 387, 616-67, and 619.

5 Hicks 2004.

6 It is possible the Lisle's had a London house, *L & P* **I/I**, 20 f.137; while Hicks 2004 links the Lisle's to the holding of office in Wiltshire which required residence in the county.

7 VCH **4**, 1911, 388. P.C.C. 7 Adeane (now listed in the National Archives as PROB 11/15). *L & P* I/I, 438 (1) m.9. According to C.E.L. (the writer is otherwise unidentified) writing in the *Topographer and Genealogist*, **2**, 1853, 308, Sir Nicholas was buried on the south side of the altar in Thruxton church, as expressly desired in his will.

8 GEC *Complete Peerage*, 1932, under Lisle at p. 45-46.

9 *Ibid.*, 46, and see Berry 1833, ix.

10 *L & P* I/I, 20, f.137 at p.17; 11 May 1509.

11 *L & P* 1/II, 833; July 1511.

12 *L & P* I/II appendix at pp. 1534-35; Lisle was listed in each of the first six years of Henry VIII's reign, as was Bishop Fox, Fox's steward William Frost, Richard Norton years 1-5 (was he father of John Norton of East Tisted?) while Ralph Pexall was listed in years 4-6 of the reign.

13 *L & P* I/I, 1176 (2), May 1512. Sandes must be Sir William Sandys of The Vyne, later Lord Sandys; and see also *Ibid.* 1221, 2 May 1512, when Sandes and Lisle were ordered to assemble and review the muster at Southampton.

14 *L & P* I/I, 1602, 28 January 1513. This appears to have been more a warning order rather than a command to muster the forces. The writ calendared here commanded the

campaign in northern France in 1513-14 but we have no details of his actual service.[15] By this stage Lisle seems to have become a senior captain or, at least, someone who was beginning to stand out from the crowd, as he is noted as one of three men appointed to command the troops assembled in Hampshire.[16] This impression is given some weight by Richard Fox's letter of 12 June 1517 wherein Lisle is listed second after Lord Audeley amongst the commissioners Fox that recommends in a letter to Wolsey, to work with him in Hampshire.[17] Lisle was again sheriff of Hampshire that year (1517-18), which may explain his position in the list.[18]

Sir John was also regularly a commissioner of the peace throughout this period, as also was Sir Ralph Pexall from the northeast of the county.[19] He was one of the commissioners tasked with seizing the property of the Scots in Hampshire in August 1513.[20] Lisle attended the meeting at the Field of the Cloth of Gold in June 1520,[21] and attended on the king at Canterbury for the meeting with Charles V in May 1522.[22] His last appearance in royal documents appears to be in February 1523, when he was again a commissioner of the array.[23] Lisle died sometime in the late winter or spring of 1523/4 but his will, although dated 1520,[24] was not proved until

county sheriffs to issue proclamations ordering all men between the ages of 16 and 60 were to assemble at an hours notice and beacons were to be prepared to call out the array.

15 *Ibid.*, 1596,

16 *L & P* I/I, 1596; 29 Jan 1513; Lisle was appointed with Sandes as the chief captain of the county; *Ibid.*, 1662 (27), February 1513 where Lisle is listed with John Tuchet, Lord Audeley and Sir William Sandes; and see also *Ibid.*, I/II, 2574, 14 January 1514; and also I/II, 2861 (32), 15 April 1514, when Lisle, Sandes, etc were ordered to survey the muster and array at Portsmouth.

17 Letter 59, 12 June 1517, written to Wolsey from St Cross, reproduced in Allen and Allen 1929.

18 *L & P* II/II, 3783, 9 November 1517, Sheriff roll.

19 *L & P* I/I, 1537. And see also *L & P* II/I, 170, 16 February 1515.

20 *L & P* I/II, 2222 (16), August 1513. Lisle (as Lysley) was listed with Sir Nicholas Wadham, Sir John Paulett, William Frost (he was Bishop Fox's steward), John Dawtrey (he was much involved in assembling war stores in Southampton and Portsmouth alongside Bishop Fox, *cf* Allen and Allen 1929, e.g. letters 38, 39, 40, 42, 43 etc).

21 *L & P* III/1, 703, and *Ibid.* 704, at p. 240 and p. 245; see also Russell 1969, at p. 201. Lisle was in the Queen's train.

22 *L & P* III/II, 2288 (2), 27 May 1522. Lisle was again appointed a commissioner of the array in August 1522, *Ibid.*, 2438 (iii).

23 *L & P* III/II, 2862.

24 John Lisle's will was listed as PCC, 19 Bodfelde, but in the National Archives is now PROB 11/21.

November 1524, at the same time as that of his wife, Mary,[25] who appears to have died only a few months after her husband.[26] It is not known when John Lisle married Mary but she was the daughter of John Courtenay of Exeter. His brother was bishop of Winchester 1487-92, while a nephew, Henry Courtenay (d. 1538), was a close associate of Bishop Fox. The Lisles had no children.

A distant cousin, Sir Thomas Lisle who had been in royal service for some years previously, and who was listed as a knight of the body in the royal household in 1515, inherited much of the Lisle estate.[27] Sir Thomas was noted as a commissioner of the peace for Hampshire in August 1524, which narrows the timescale for Sir John and Mary's deaths down to within a few months in 1524.[28]

Sir John Lisle seems to have been a reasonably typical Shire knight. He did not rise to especial prominence but appears rather to have been a reliable, safe pair of hands who could be trusted with a number of duties, ranging from preparations for war to leadership on the battlefield, and from exercising a role in local judicial affairs, to the raising of taxes and regulation of new laws.[29] The size of the tomb and chapel he commissioned from Thomas Bertie give some indicator of his personal wealth, as also does that of Sir Ralph Pexall whose monument is on a similar scale. We may also point to the presence of the Lisle arms in the vault of the presbytery south aisle in the cathedral, these perhaps indicating a closer and possibly longer lasting relationship between Lisle and Bishop Fox than has previously been realised.[30]

25 Mary Lisle's will was listed under Lysley (which is how the surname appears in the will) as PCC, 27 Bodfelde but in the National Archives is now PROB 11/21.

26 VCH 4, 1911, 388; and see *L & P* IV/I, 895 (19), 19 November 1524, grant of the livery of the lands held by Sir John Lisle of Wooton in the Isle of Wight and of Thruxton (and cites the Lisle ancestry to both John and Mary from whom Thomas inherited).

27 *L & P* II/I, 2735.

28 *L & P* III/II, 3282, 30 August 1523.

29 Lisle was for example one of the commissioners concerning with the survey and assessment for the imparking of lands in 1517, as noted in *L & P* II/II, 3297, 28 May 1517.

30 The Lisle's arm's appear in both the aisle vaults and in the main vault above the presbytery. This is the only occurrence of a heraldic device other than those of the crown and of Fox and his episcopate, which points strongly to Lisle's position in Hampshire alongside Fox in local politics.

Dating the tombs and their chronology

The only tomb that has any direct documentary evidence is that of the Lisles at Thruxton and this can be dated between to 1524-27, on the basis of the documentary evidence in the Lisle's wills and the presence of a plaque on the chapel frieze with the date 1527 carved upon it. The Pexall monument could have been erected soon after the death of Edith Pexall (née Brocas) in 1519, but there is no specific documentary evidence for this. The Brocas family were a long established family from northeast Hampshire with a principal residence at Beaurepaire.[31] The male line failed in 1506 when William Brocas died; his younger daughter Edith inherited the estate, which, following her death, passed to her husband Sir Ralph Pexall.

Given that Edith Pexall died in 1519, it seems possible that Pexall commissioned Thomas Bertie soon after to design and build the monument and chantry at Sherborne St John in a style that parallels that of the cathedral south presbytery screen. As I have discussed in the last chapter, the south screen can be considered earlier than the north screen. The work for the Lisles at Thruxton, created in the mid 1520s, mirrors the style of the presbytery north screen. I have therefore taken this as the chronology to be followed here, but it has to be said that there is no reason to suppose that the Pexall chantry could not be dated until after the work for the Lisles was completed; Sir Ralph Pexall himself not dying until *c.*1538.[32]

31 For Brocas of Beaurepaire, VCH 4, 1911, 165-66; and see also VCH 3, 1908, 213.

32 Sir Ralph Pexall's will was granted probate on 12 February 1538 (PROB 11/27; previously in the Register of Dyngeley); and see VCH 3, 1908, detail from family tree shown on p. 213; and VCH 4, 1911, 166.

1. The Pexall monument at Sherborne St John [33]

The Pexall monument is strikingly similar to the Lisle monument at Thruxton, and to the cathedral screens, as the frieze here closely parallels that on the presbytery south screen. Pevsner noted the Renaissance quality of the Pexall monument in the introductory essay to his Hampshire volume, with the comment, 'just a little of the Renaissance is in evidence' here.[34] In his specific entry for Sherborne St John, he notices the fragments of work in the north chapel and describes the tomb-chest, rather surprisingly, as having 'minimum Renaissance decoration'.[35] Of the frieze and the canopy, there is no mention at all.

For Pevsner, the most interesting part of this church is the porch to the south door. This has a plaque with the date 1533 above the door, while the spandrels in the door case contain Renaissance decoration.[36] Not specifically mentioned by Pevsner is the donor panel and plaque over the south door. The panel also has Renaissance detail though not in a style that is recognisably Thomas Bertie's. The south door and porch are discussed further below, after discussion of the Pexall monument.[37]

The Pexall chantry

The chapel has an east window with a moulded label over it; on the stops of the label are shields which carry the letters R and P and which must presumably indicate Ralph Pexall who, we might assume, had extensive works carried out to this chapel or was it he who had it built? The situation at Sherborne St John is paralleled by that at Thruxton, where there is documentary evidence to show a new chapel was erected in the 1520, and it is possible that Thomas Bertie was confronted by the same requirement for the Pexalls, that of creating both a tomb monument and a chapel.

The Pexall monument occupies the west bay in the north wall of the chancel and is mostly contained within the width of the wall (figs 162 and 199). The tomb

33 I am greatly indebted to the Rev. I Hamilton who loaned me the keys to the church, which is normally kept locked, and left me to my survey.

34 Pevsner 1967, 33.

35 *Ibid*, 501.

36 *Ibid*.

37 See pp. 317-18

chest with effigies of Ralph and Edith Pexall is set in the eastern half of this bay. The arch framing the Pexall monument is elaborately carved and moulded. The arch is four centred and the spandrels are filled with *all'antica* motifs. Above the arch is a stringcourse with shields and above that, a frieze with *all'antica* motifs set in a continuous band.

To the north of the Pexall monument is square chapel with an east window that is probably original. The door in the north wall may be post-Tudor in date. A plan of the church made in 1884 shows that an arch giving access to this area did not then, as it does now, pierce the chapel west wall (fig. 199).[38] Within the chapel, and particularly on the floor where there are several brasses, are a number of memorials to members of the Broccas family. Was the chapel a piece of architectural work executed by Thomas Bertie?

Built into the north wall of the chapel, and set within a plain recess, are three sections of heavily carved stonework. Where did these come from and what was their original purpose? The note of their existence in the VCH description is apparently the first record of these pieces within the church.[39] All three pieces are different (fig.s 200-202). The top piece lies on its side and should be rotated so that the moulding is on the right and the carved detail on the left. The carving features a pair of slashed volutes with ball terminals above what would seem to be a stylised pomegranate which is surrounded by leafy cartouches and with flowers beneath. The other pieces are sections of frieze or panel-work, and these feature very clearly a repeated rose set in the manner of a Gothic vine-trail. The rose here is almost certainly intended to have been a heraldic Tudor rose. It is possible that these pieces are the remains of an architectural work now lost, perhaps the original surround to the chapel window or (perhaps the more likely as these pieces show no signs of weathering) the surround to a door or screen into the chapel.[40]

These pieces have no parallel with any other work by Thomas Bertie but this need not indicate they were not from his workshop. As it is unlikely that Bertie

38 The plan of the church is reproduced from a collection of church plans gathered together and published on the web at www. churchplansonline.org

39 *Ibid*, 169-70.

40 An 1884 plan of the church shows that the chantry was accessed from the chancel and that the west wall of the chapel was apparently then not pierced, as it is now by an arched entry.

would have removed an earlier monument from this part of the church it seems reasonable to suppose that it was he who broke through the chancel wall to create the Pexall monument and chapel beyond.

The Pexall monument

The Pexall monument lies beneath an arch of which the soffit and jambs are panelled in blank tracery (fig. 203). The spandrels in the arch are filled with *all'antica* decoration emerging from behind lozenges, here these carry the letters **R P** on the left, the letters set alone, and **R E** on the right with the letters linked by a cord, these for Ralph Pexall and, entwined with a "Lovers' knot", for Ralph and Edith (figs 204 and 205).[41]

The stringcourse above the arch over the tomb, and which contains three shields, and then an *all'antica* styled frieze above. This duplicates the style of the presbytery south screen, although with variations to the style (fig. 203). The Pexall frieze follows the same general tri-partite design of the cathedral presbytery work and employs many of the same motifs. There are two smaller shields on the stringcourse with a larger shield complete with helm and mantling above it, in the centre (figs 203-205); this layout and general style of design recurs at Thruxton. The centrally placed helm is quite plain although there are traces of paintwork here, as also on the shields;[42] it is not known if this paint is original.

As in the cathedral, the stonework is bounded along the bottom by a square-cut moulding that, at the southeast end of the frieze, is turned vertically to enclose it. The other four ends were left 'open' or perhaps were left unfinished. The *all'antica* work consists of a repetitive, symmetrical sequence of motifs set, rinceaux-fashion, along a line (fig. 206). None of the end points of the frieze are the same, the only 'standard' feature is that where a length of frieze ends an individual motif is bisected

41 We may note that this use of a cord to link initials does not always carry with it the implication that it was intended as a lovers' knot. In the cathedral, we have observed how both priors Silkstede's and Broke's initials were displayed linked with such a cord. At Layer Marney, the letters M C linked with a cord are displayed on the roof cresting; this has been taken to indicate Marney and his wife Catherine. Why the surname? A more likely explanation is that this refers to Marney Capitanus, his title as Captain of the king's bodyguard.

42 The shields display the arms of the Broccas and Pexall families.

in approximate halves; thus we cannot determine if there was a deliberate opening motif to these friezes.

Taking the first complete motif on both faces as a start point, the sequence is as follows (fig. 206): urn 1 with blank shield and swags above/slashed volute/urn 2 with ?fruit motif above/slashed volute/ urn 3 with winged putto head above/slashed volute/urn 2 repeated/slashed volute/urn 3 repeated/slashed volute/urn 2 repeated/restart sequence with urn 1. Urn 2 is much the same across the frieze, but the fruit above is treated differently so that no one is the same as the next in the sequence. This change in detail is more apparent with the treatment to the urns under each of the putti. The detailing on the surfaces of these differs markedly as does the stand on which each urn sits. The same observation can be made about the shields. So, as we have seen again and again, from the St Cross frieze onwards, there is this quality of apparent harmony and metronomic symmetry which, on closer inspection, proves to be an illusion. The effect is somewhat spoilt by the mis-match evident in some of the frieze joints, where one half of a motif is of a disparate design to the other half. This echoes the non-matching nature of the frieze joints seen in the two friezes in the cathedral. There does not seem to be any logical explanation for this though it is hardly to be supposed that this was a deliberate design feature.

Before leaving the frieze, we might note the treatment of the volutes. These emerge from behind each urn and, in a rather cramped fashion, are turned up and into the adjacent urn with a foliate neck at the top (figs 204-206). Fashioning of this motif presages the sequence of stylistic changes that we can see in the treatment of the volutes in the presbytery north screen frieze and, additionally, those at Thruxton and Christchurch. Even in so small a detail, we can see an evolving style and the search for a finished product, an ambition to evolve the taste for *all'antica* into a satisfying end product. If it is correct to suggest that Bertie created the Lisle frieze in the mid 1520s, and this is, as we shall see, a direct parallel to the presbytery north screen frieze, then it is probably correct to interpret the Pexall frieze as an evolution of Bertie's friezework that stands in between the two presbytery friezes. This then perhaps reflects back on both dating and chronology, suggesting that Bertie completed the Pexall monument before working on the presbytery north frieze and the Lisle monument. That said, it is not inconceivable that Pexall, who did not die

until *c.*1540, chose the style of the frieze on the basis of personal preference which would negate any chronology based on stylistic development.

The Pexall tomb

The tomb chest with its effigies is set against the east jamb of the arch with a space between it and the west jamb (fig. 203). The west jamb has an incurved rebate – was the tomb originally set, or intended to be set, on this side of the arch? Or was this the intended original entrance into the chapel from the chancel of the church? The nineteenth-century plan of the church seems to indicate that this was indeed the original chapel entry (fig. 199). The tomb chest stands on a stepped plinth, two faces of the chest are covered in carved panels, but the east face is against the adjacent arch jamb and cannot presently be seen, while the choir stalls in the chancel obscure the south face. The tomb is capped with a thin stringcourse onto which has been painted an inscription, and this is bounded either side by mouldings (figs 207 and 208). The inscription, in the same script as that seen of the presbytery south screen frieze, records in Latin who is buried here.[43] Two effigies lie on top. Ralph Pexall in armour to the north and his wife, Edith to the south (figs 203 and 209);[44] they lie with their hands clasped together and in which they clutch, rather unusually, their hearts. Both were carved in a fine-grained limestone and both are strikingly similar to the effigies at Thruxton.

The two carved faces of the tomb are carved with rectilinear panels bounded by plain, distinctive roll mouldings (figs 207 and 208). The north face has three larger panels set between four narrow, rectangular panels. The entire design of the this tomb is very much in the style of the Pontoise tomb in Winchester cathedral (fig. 174), with the same style of work utilised along with the same arrangement of panels. In the centre is a now blank plaque with cartouches top and bottom and a rather curious tassled edge either side, which would have perhaps been more appropriate top and bottom. In the left, larger panel is a shield charged with the

[43] This reads, 'Conditur hoc tumulto Radulphus noie Pexsal armiger et simul hic cojugis ossa jacent Edithe heredis nuper ac pulcherrima proles Guillelmi armigeri Brocas Beaurepaire'.

[44] At Thruxton the setting is reversed so that Sir John Lisle lies on the south.

Pexall coat-of-arms with, either side, an unusual variation on the cartouches seen elsewhere, here using a central urn from which emerges a pair of foliate forms that curve around the edges of the shield. On the right is a second coat-of-arms, for Broccas, with in each diagonal an urn with floral volutes. In both cases the armorial bearings are carved; it is not known if the remaining paintwork is original. Each of the thin, rectangular panels contains a sequence of stacked urns culminating in a floral motif. These 'pilaster' style panels are repeated on the end of the tomb where they enclose two further panels with shields. These again have coats-of-arms, in this instance, these are painted but the panels are otherwise plain.

The Pexall effigies

The figure of Ralph is shown lying full length, his bare head resting on a shield charged with the Pexall arms (fig. 209). The figure is somewhat damaged, for example much of his sword is missing. Of some interest here is the treatment to the knee guards; these have the same *all'antica* styled cartouches as may be seen around panels in the cathedral and is a feature also of the work at Thruxton. The elbow guards have a star-shaped device; this formed part of the Pexall badge, which was a moor's head with a radiating sun behind, the rays of the sun organised rather like a star shape. The moor's head is not shown in the tomb work here but another moor's head appears in the work for the Norton's at East Tisted and I shall describe this below.

This completes the description for the Pexall monument and chapel; Bertie may however have executed other work at this church.

The church south door and the porch

Quite unconnected with the Pexall monument is the south porch to the church, and this may also have been built by Thomas Bertie (fig. 210). It appears to have been an addition made by the benefaction of James Spyre or Spier in 1533. Nothing is more known of James and his wife, who were presumably wealthy local people. That it may have been another piece of work created by Thomas Bertie can be seen by

elements in this work that are characteristic of his style. Above the porch door is a plaque with a carved inscription,[45] and this has the now familiar cartouches either side (fig. 211). Beneath, in the spandrels of the doorway, are further examples of Bertie's style of *all'antica* spandrel work (fig. 211). These spandrels do not have the sharpness of Bertie's work elsewhere, this probably a result both of the stone type used – a limestone – as well as the erosion of the stone by weathering. In both spandrels is a shield, each bears the letter I and these presumably represent James and Jane Spier; from these project the usual array of urns capped with a floral motif that we have seen elsewhere in Bertie's work. Within the porch and set above the church south door, is another panel which also has an inscription and beneath which the now headless figures of the donors appear.[46]

The porch was built in coursed brickwork with stone quoins and dressings with a deeply moulded label over the doorway. Is this porch really the work of Bertie or can it be a product of his workshop and thus perhaps more appropriately assigned to one of his junior masons? It should nevertheless be seen a potential evidence for Bertie's building activities outside the precincts of the cathedral, or amongst the domestic structures associated with the bishop.

Affixed above the south door is a second plaque with a donor panel above it (fig. 212). This plaque is somewhat different to that on the porch and while inscribed also in a coarse style of Roman lettering, it is evident that the two plaques were chiselled by different hands. Above the plaque is a donor panel that shows a pair of figures kneeling at desks, a man to the left and a woman to the right who we might identify as representing James and Jane Spier (they are now headless though whether through the agency of iconoclasts or vandals or a more recent era is uncertain), while above them is a niche that would presumably once have held a statuary piece representing Jesus or a favoured saint. While the central niche carries string overtones of the Gothic style, the remainder of the panel shows a determined effort to represent some form of Classical setting with the Classical columns either

45 The inscription, in coarse Roman lettering, reads, 'Of your cherete pray for the sowles of Jamys Spyre and Jane his wyf which caused this porch to be mad at ther cost in the year of our Lod 1533', pers. obs. See also, VCH Hampshire 4, 1911, 168.

46 The second inscription reads, 'Of your cherete pray for the soul of Jamys Spier departed in the year of our Lord a mdxxxiiii on hos soul Jesu have marsi', pers. obs.; and see Pevsner 1967, 501.

side of the panel especially striking. This however is not a piece that can be paralleled with another work by Thomas Bertie. The donor panel with figures also appears in a tomb, that for the Nortons at East Tisted, which intimates that even if this was not carved by Bertie it was of a style that Bertie would also adopt. All of this is work that belongs in the 1530s, let us return to the 1520s, and examine now Bertie's work at Thruxton.

2. The Lisle chantry at Thruxton

Sir John Lisle included instructions in his will, dated 1520, for the making of 'an ambulatory chapel unto the honour of God and of our blessed Lady Saint Mary virgin mother of our Savyour Ihu Crist.'[47] Subsequently, Lisle's widow left instructions to her executors in her will, dated 1524, to 'cause to be made a chapel or an ambulatory after the plot and bargain made by my husbonde wt my lorde of Wynchestre's mason'.[48] This documentation implies that if the work had indeed been begun prior to 1524, it remained incomplete at the time of Mary's death. Although we might beware of taking the formulaic language of a will at face value, we might nevertheless interpret this document as merely confirming the original intention to build a chapel and ensuring that money remained available for its completion.[49] The stonework itself clearly demonstrates that the wishes of both John and Mary Lisle were eventually fulfilled.

There is further, if obscure, documentation which refers to the chantry at Thruxton. One of Sir John Lisle's cousins, George Rogers, left a request in his will,

47 John Lisle's will was listed as PCC, 19 Bodfelde, but in the National Archives is now PROB 11/21; and see VCH Hampshire 4, 1911, 389, n.66.

48 Mary Lisle's will was listed under Lysley (which is how the surname appears in the will) as PCC, 27 Bodfelde but in the National Archives is now PROB 11/21; and see VCH Hampshire 4, 1911, 389, n.66.

49 Pevsner, 1967, 33, dates the monument at Thruxton to *c.*1520, although on the next page he contradicts himself and says a date for Thruxton is lacking.

also of 1524, that he be buried in 'the new chantry at Thrukkeston'.[50] There is no record that shows this wish was honoured, but it does offer us some evidence to show that the chantry chapel may well have been in physical existence by 1524 although perhaps it was not completed, as we shall see, until 1527.

The Lisle chantry comprises the remains of a large chapel attached to the northeast side of the church. This was entered through a large arched opening from the north side of the nave (figs 213 and 214). The tomb for Sir John Lisle and his wife lies on the south side of this chapel, occupying an arch cut into the north wall of the chancel. Only the two arches and the tomb itself survive from this arrangement, along with fragments from the chapel frieze – the remainder was taken down in the late eighteenth century and replaced with a vestry in 1839.[51]

The tower and the chapel frieze

Pevsner was apparently so diverted by the Victorian restoration of the church that he ignored much of the earlier structure, including the church tower;[52] at any rate, he failed to mention the tower with its frieze.[53] Although he noted the tower had been rebuilt, he did not notice the important Renaissance detail around its top. This cannot be *in situ* and documents seen by the writers of the description of the church in VCH reveal that the tower was built in 1801, using materials taken from the chantry chapel that once stood on the northeast side of the church.[54] Because the style of this work differs to that employed for the tomb within the church, along with its date and the potential for it to tell us much about a lost chapel, I will discuss this in a separate chapter – Chapter 14 – rather than digress from the main theme of

50 My attention was drawn to this will through e-mail correspondence between the vicar of Thruxton, Ann McKenzie, and Elizabeth Howard who is a descendent of Rogers; George Rogers' will is listed in the National Archives as PROB 11/21 (formerly in the Register of Bodfelde) and probate was granted 5 October 1524.

51 A plaque on the exterior of the vestry gives this date, pers. obs.

52 The date 1869 is carved on the stringcourse beneath the east window of the chancel and this presumably records the Victorian restoration of the building.

53 Pevsner and Lloyd 1967, 620-21. The division of this survey is explained on p.12 and this makes it clear that Pevsner himself surveyed and wrote the description for Thruxton, and it is quite evident from his omissions that it was not one of his better days.

54 VCH 4, 1911, 389.

describing Thomas Bertie's *all'antica* styled tomb work. Pevsner noted the Lisle tomb but failed to mention the north side of the tomb with its *all'antica* workmanship.[55]

The Lisle tomb

By the 1520s the east end of Thruxton church had for more than a century been a burial place of the Lisle family. A fine brass lies on the chancel floor and commemorates Sir John Lisle who died *c.*1407.[56] There is a tomb-chest on the south side of the chancel which also occupies an arch that cuts through the chancel wall.[57] This can be dated stylistically to the fifteenth century, but is devoid of any identifying marks; it is probably the tomb of Sir Nicholas Lisle, John Lisle's father, who died before 1506.[58]

On the opposite, north side of the chancel is a second tomb-chest that also must belong to the fifteenth century. It too has no identifying marks, as the brass-work that once adorned it has been removed.[59] The tomb may have been that of the Sir John Lisle, who died in 1471.[60] We do not know if this tomb was always here, but it does seem likely that this was so, and as such it probably occupied an arched recess in what was then the external north wall of the chancel. Leaving this earlier Lisle tomb in place and incorporating it into their own monument, John and Mary Lisle also decided to create an ambulatory chapel. This was to be attached to the

55 *Ibid.*, 621.

56 VCH Hampshire **4**, 1911, 390; and see Pevsner 1967, 620.

57 The south face of this tomb can be seen in the external face of the chancel wall and this is somewhat surprising. Was there originally a small chapel on the south side of the church? It hardly seems likely that the tomb originally projected into the open air, although the Victorian renovation of the church seems content to have allowed this to now be the case.

58 The anonymous CEL writing in 1853 in *Topographer and Genealogist*, **2**, at p.308 noted the by the terms of his will dated 1496 and proved in 1506, Sir Nicholas Lisle desired to be buried on the south side of the high altar in the church at Thruxton. As VCH **4**, 1911, 390, notes, this tomb has no inscription or other identifying marks. Sir Nicholas Lisle's [Lysle] will is listed in the National Archives under PROB 11/15, but was previously identified as PCC, 7 Adeane.

59 The pin holes for fixing the shields can be seen on the tomb-chest south face and there is evidence from the lip of the tomb chest top that a brass rail or strip was originally set in the moulding here. C.E.L., writing in *Topographer and Genealogist* 1853, **2**, 306-11, noted that the brasswork was then missing; he also noted the Lisle tomb of the 1520s though without identifying the work as Renaissance.

60 VCH Hampshire **4**, 1911, 390; where the north face of the tomb was identified as probably being an addition to the Purbeck marble tomb.

north side of the church, to perpetuate the memory of themselves and the Lisles (fig. 213). This would then explain the unusual arrangement of incorporating a tomb-chest that is clearly of a different, Gothic, style amongst Renaissance work that was, in the 1520s, at the height of fashion.

The west arch and all'antica *motifs in spandrels*

In the early sixteenth century, it would appear that there was no north aisle to the church and that the earlier monument in the northeast corner of the chancel stood against or occupied an arched niche cut into the north wall.[61] The Lisle's new chapel was attached to the north wall of the church, with access provided through a second, west, arch (see plan shown in fig 213 and see fig 214). This arrangement presumably provided both the necessary access to the chapel and the degree of privacy that generally is a mark of such structures.

It is probable that Bertie would have had to take down the entire north wall of the chancel, and part of the nave wall also, in order to create a chapel that was possibly some 10 metres long by about 4.5 metres wide. The proximity of both arches to the roof-plate indicates that neither of these could have been inserted without removing the existing wall; the roof could have been supported on temporary jacks while the new work was being undertaken. Bertie would certainly have been familiar with this process from work on the cathedral in the later 1510s, when 'temporary' timberwork was inserted at that time in the north and south transepts – this survives to this day.[62]

The four-centred west arch, spanning the entry into the chapel, is itself typical of the period and the only feature of further interest is the treatment of the spandrels. These contain heraldry on the south faces and, somewhat water-damaged, a shield and a lozenge with lettering on the north. The former shows on the east (fig. 215) one of the Lisle arms, the sun through the clouds, and on the east, another of his arms, a fesse between three martlets or choughs (fig. 216).[63] The latter

61 Pevsner 1967, 620, says the north aisle was added in 1869 but there is no documentary evidence to substantiate this.

62 This work is described above in Chapter 4.

63 This detail is given in VCH Hampshire 4, 1911, 390.

has on the north a damaged shield bearing an initial L on the right and this was linked to a presumed initial on the left by a complex design incorporating a cord and a floral motif (fig. 217). This motif appears also on the north face of the tower where the linked initials are T and L; these for Thomas Lisle who appears to have patronised the completion of the Lisle work. The spandrel details on the north-west have been much damaged but includes a lozenge with what appears to be the letters M and I, again linked with a cord, and again enfolding other motifs including the Lisle sunburst though perhaps a date may also have been included (fig. 218). All four spandrels are otherwise dominated by rinceaux-work that brings together volutes, foliage and flowers that are executed in the same idiom as those seen above Prior Broke's door in the presbytery north screen at Winchester cathedral. The parallel between the southeast spandrel at Thruxton and the west spandrel in Broke's door is particularly close (fig. 184).

The treatment of spandrels in this manner is very much a distinguishing mark of Thomas Bertie's work and may be seen wherever Bertie found an opportunity to insert a spandrel and the Lisle tomb canopy offers further examples of this aspect of his work.

The Lisle tomb, canopy and frieze

Having, as seems probable, taken down the north wall of the chancel, Bertie erected a central pier, the stonework of which is cut around the mouldings of the earlier tomb-chest (figs 214 and 219). That this pier is of one build can be seen from the joints which run completely though it. It is panelled with blank arcading with trefoil cusped heads on its internal faces, the west arch panelling slightly different to that of the east, while on the north and south faces the tracery of the panelling is more simplified.

As with Prior Broke's door, at Thruxton the jambs on the south face of the canopy are ornately carved with rinceaux-work, and the spandrels filled with *all'antica* motifs (figs 220 and 221). The jambs on the north face of the canopy are blank. Unlike Broke's door, which has a single style of decoration all around it, at Thruxton the treatment of the jambs differs from one side to the other and with a

further change of theme in the transom, though why this should be so is difficult to discern. That said, there is no reason to doubt the integrity of the work existing as a single piece. There is no case to suggest that this represents an amalgam of two lots of work from different settings. The jambs are covered with a running design of rinceaux that links a series of volutes with the Lisle heraldic motif of sunrays emerging from a cloud alternating with a second motif that is mostly a floral motif (fig. 222). Along the top, west, section, the floral motif is replaced by an urn with what are either flames emerging from its top or leaves (fig. 221). On the top, east, section the carving is of a complex inter-linked pattern that more closely resembles the work on Prior Broke's door (fig. 220). Here slashed volutes are inter-twined with floral motifs in a double-lyre pattern. Again paralleling Broke's door, the Thruxton work is quite shallowly carved but this does nothing to detract from the graphic quality of the work, which is strongly visible.

All four arch spandrels are filled with further *all'antica* motifs that follow the style of the west arch (figs 220 and 221). Each spandrel shows a linear arrangement that starts with a shield with thereafter a jointed sequence of motifs that include urns, volutes and floral and foliate motifs. All the shields are now blank.

Set above the tomb canopy is a multi-ordered, carved frieze with, at the centre-point, a coat-of-arms topped with a helm and mantling (figs 220 and 221).[64] There is a style departure here though. The string-course with shields that features on the presbytery screens and is present on the Pexall monument (and re-appears on the Norton tomb) is absent at Thruxton, where the single coat-of-arms is set on top of the freizework. However, there was a stringcourse with the external chapel frieze, this is now on the tower, so the architectural element was clearly not abandoned by Bertie here.[65]

The tomb monument frieze comprises of a sequence of carved sections, set one above the next, beginning from the bottom with a line of egg-and-ball work with, above, a line of fretwork (figs 219-221). These support a curved moulding that extends slightly beyond the lower work, and which is decorated with a symmetrical,

64 We may note here that the north side of the canopy frieze over the Lisle tomb has been cut back, presumably this occurred during the nineteenth-century when the chapel was converted into a vestry and the ante-chapel was occupied by an organ.

65 The tower and frieze there is described below in Chapter 14.

repetitive sequence of work, which was presumably intended to be in the spirit of acanthus leaves. The same general feel of style can be seen in the work on the terracotta tombs in East Anglia. Between each leaf is a three-point motif that, from its angularity, seems to be no more than an artificial device utilised here to give this element of the frieze a sense of unity, as well as to add an element of interest. This motif re-appears on the Norton tomb at East Tisted and is described below.

Capping this architectural sequence is a frieze with rinceaux that are strikingly similar to those used on the cathedral presbytery north screen, frieze designs 3, 4 and 6. The central element of a five-pointed motif, a palmette, complete with thin bladed, sharp-pointed leaves is set above a pair of volutes and between a pair of cornucopias, the mouths of which are filled with a pile of fruit (figs 220 and 221). This palmette design reappears at Christchurch, in the Draper chantry, where it appears in the frieze and as supporting elements to Draper's initials, and is also set upside down on plinths that would have been the supporting stands, or corbels, for statuary.

The palmette motif is not found amongst those employed in the St Cross or Silkstede friezes, and perhaps offers us the strongest clue of all that Bertie had access to a wider source of motif designs drawn from Classical sources. As for this particular motif, it can be seen on the Pantheon and the Temple of Hercules in Rome as well as, for example, on sarcophagi in the collections displayed in the Vatican museum; it is to be seen also in Florence, and at the Certosa di Pavia and in Milan.[66] However, palmettes also occur amongst the motifs employed amongst the *all'antica* work applied to the chantry built for Margaret Pole at Christchurch priory and this may perhaps have been the source for Thomas Bertie's use of the motif.

The design and layout of the work on the Thruxton tomb frieze again matches that at Winchester. As before, the frieze has a square moulding frame along its base and at each end. The top of the frieze has no formal boundary. This is the same design-element as used at Sherborne St John. The only frieze of the Bertie series that has a crest is that on Draper's chantry screen at Christchurch, where a crennelated crest caps the frieze with, additionally, cusped and crocketed finials

[66] All pers. obs. and noted as part of a deliberate search for motifs in Italy and France that I undertook in 2002 and again in 2004.

standing above the work. Was the change of emphasis on the Draper work a deliberate design and style change effected to give the Draper chantry some sense of stylistic affinity with the Pole chantry, and perhaps the client (Draper) wishing to capture something of the prestige of the other's chapel? There is no surviving documentation for Draper's chapel which might have informed our understanding of what dictated the design process but it is more than likely that if the Pole chapel had already been built then Draper would have wished to capture or echo something of the authority and prestige of the Pole chapel in his own. As for the cresting, the implication would seem to be that Bertie did not reckon that cresting on top of his friezes was essential and, in his design work, he was content to leave them out.

The coat-of-arms on the south face of the Lisle monument matches that on the north apart from the treatment of the helm. The helm on the north face is plain. That on the south has been slightly damaged with part of the face having been lost. Of more interest, the south face helm has *all'antica* decoration (figs 220 and 221); this is also a feature of Sir John Lisle's effigy. We may also note that there are differences of treatment to the two shields: that on the north a traditionally shaped shield displaying the quartered arms of Lisle, while on the south a more decorative shield is shown, with part of the full armorial achievement missing. This style of shield reflects a usage in the vault over the presbytery in Winchester cathedral where similarly styled shields also appear.[67] Given the associations already noted between the two sites, this must have been another deliberate design choice.

The Lisle tomb

The earlier Purbeck marble tomb chest stands on the hautpace of the chancel, which stands somewhat above the level of the chapel (now vestry) to the north. This did not pose too much of a problem to Bertie whose ground-level work usually included a plinth with various, generally quite plain, mouldings. At Thruxton, the plinth is plainer than most and terminates with a roll moulding (fig. 223).

67 pers. obs.

The Renaissance tomb front, that is to say the north face of the tomb, has five panels; three that are filled with shields and two with urns, all of which are decorated with *all'antica* motifs (figs 224 and 225). The panels form a rectangular sequence that occupies most of the tomb front. The centre and largest has a blank plaque supported by quite elaborate cartouches (fig. 225). Either side are square panels with shields. That on the left shows the arms of Lisle quartered with Cormeilles (fig. 226), the lozenge shield on the right shows the arms of Courtenay, Mary Lisle's family (fig. 227).[68] At either end are narrow panels both filled with an urn or vase. The parallel with the tombs in the presbytery north screen in Winchester cathedral is once again pronounced.

The central panel, the largest, has a blank plaque with, both at either end and at top and bottom, clasping cartouches (fig. 225). The cartouches at each end twist outwards into curled rinceaux and surround a four-leaved flower, with, outside, a single leaf. At first sight, we might assume these flowers to be Tudor roses but this is probably not so here. Strictly speaking, the Tudor rose has five sepals and, most usually in depictions of this device, the rose is multi-layered with a less pronounced centre. The distinction is important in this context, because in the right-hand armorial panel the flower head is paired with a pomegranate and, again, the single leaf. If this is identified as a Tudor rose, then the combination would imply a reference to Henry VIII and Katherine of Aragon. However, it is equally likely to be an example of Christian iconography, with the pomegranate a well-known reference to the Resurrection. This view is leant some weight by the inclusion in the far right panel of an urn from which emerges three stalks of grain, with ears of barley or wheat that are especially well defined (fig. 224). Here then a clear reference to the Eucharist but, equally, a reference also to the Holy Trinity because there are *three* stalks. The urns, for there is a second urn at the other end of the sequence, can be equated with chalices and thus a further reference to the Eucharist.

The style of the work at Thruxton echoes many aspects of that seen in the presbytery screens in Winchester cathedral, and while some of these details have

[68] Mary Courtenay was the daughter of Sir John Courtenay, sixth son of Sir Philip Courtenay of Powderham, Devon. Her uncle was bishop of Winchester from 1487 to 1492. Her cousin, Henry Courtenay, was an associate of Bishop Fox and a benefactor of Bishop Fox's will.

already been noted, it is necessary to point out features showing just how strong the parallel between the two is, as this has a bearing on Bertie's work elsewhere. The overall style of starkly rectilinear and angular panels set within a very plain roll-moulding is a further aspect of Bertie's work, with the use of varying sizes of panels another style characteristic. The central Lisle panel is an almost exact replica of the tomb front made for Harthacnut's tomb (fig. 178), while the two end panels on the Lisle tomb march with those on the Pontoise tomb (figs 174, 175, 180 and 181), right down to matching details of the urns and the various motifs that emerge from them. The geometric organisation of the work around the Courtenay arms in the Lisle front is a further indicator of Bertie's work where *all'antica* motifs are set along the diagonal lines through a panel – here at Thruxton the workmanship is assured and (almost) symmetrical, unlike in the cathedral where there are clear mistakes in the execution of the carving. The *all'antica* motifs in this last panel also echo the work in the presbytery south frieze but this is more striking in the parallel to be drawn with the frieze at Sherborne-St John described above.

The Lisle effigies

There are two effigies, that on the south of a man dressed in armour with, beside him, a woman in a long dress with a 'kennel' head-dress from which her hair escapes and is spread either side of her head (figs 214 and 228). Pevsner tells us that 'the effigies are carved in a fine-grained limestone and alas somewhat re-cut'.[69] The description in VCH states 'they are said to be the work of an Italian artist brought over by Lord Sandys'.[70] These effigies, like the Pexall effigies, have otherwise not attracted any further scholarly attention.

The man is bare-headed and lies with his hands clasped together, his head on his shield and his feet resting on his gauntlets. The armour would appear to be accurately portrayed, with close attention having been paid to the finer detail of its component parts and its articulation. The Lisle arms appear across the knight's torso

[69] Pevsner 1967, 620.

[70] VCH Hampshire **4**, 1911, 390. The accreditation to an Italian artist is not further elucidated in VCH description and no reference is given as to where this comment was sourced.

and on the shoulder plates. A chain [collar] of linked SS and roses (note these are the five-petalled Lancastrian roses) hangs from his shoulders. A particular feature of this effigy is the inclusion of *all'antica* decorative motifs on his armour. These appear particularly on his shield and on his elbow-pieces (fig. 218). This is also a feature of the Pexall effigy at Sherborne St John, as noted previously. The feel of this work on the armour is very much in keeping with that employed on the tomb panels and canopy work, which raises the prospect as to whether Bertie can be associated with the carving of the effigies or, perhaps, in their design.

The Lisle monument – concluding comments

Completed sometime in the later 1520s, the Lisle chantry was perhaps the first larger work Thomas Bertie undertook outside the cathedral and his work for Bishop Fox, although he may have previously built on a similar scale at Sherborne St John for the Pexalls. In a sense the distinction is not particularly great, as Sir John Lisle was anyway an important figure in the local county affairs and, through his wife, connected to the Courtenay family who also were associated with Fox.[71] The presence of Lisle heraldry, sunbeams emerging from a cloud, on several bosses in the south presbytery aisle points to an even closer relationship that has otherwise not been noticed.[72]

There is a final point to make before we leave Thruxton. We have noticed what is present amongst the work on the Lisle chantry, but not that what is absent. While the chapel frieze, now on the tower, features centred medallions supported by fantastic creatures in the *all'antica* manner, these contribute a minimal element of the design. On the tomb and its canopy, the *all'antica* work can be characterised by its non-zoomorphic quality for there are no fantastic creatures here, nor any putti or other zoomorphic elements that are so much a defining feature of the St Cross frieze. Bertie has here produced a piece of work that apparently attempts to show an awareness of the Classical orders set in an ordered sequence that, too, is redolent of

[71] Henry Courtenay, Marquis of Exeter, was an executor and benefactor of Fox's will, on Fox's will, see Allen and Allen, 1929, Appendix III; on Courtenay, see Archer 2004.

[72] Pers. obs. There is no full study of the bosses in the presbytery aisles in print.

Classical origins even if the final result is still a synthesised product skewed through the use of *all'antica* motifs. We can return to this aspect of Bertie's work later. In reviewing his secondary works, we need to bear in mind that Bertie appears to have developed an aesthetic taste that led him away from the super-abundant inclusion of *all'antica* motifs in his work, something that is so marked a trait of the terracotta tombs in East Anglia. Could Bertie have been aware of these monuments? The recent discovery of terracotta work at Clerkenwell in London, that parallels the work in the East Anglian tombs, suggests it is conceivable that Bertie might well have been aware of this style of workmanship.[73]

3. Later ecclesiastical monuments

Based on his style, we can associate a further two funerary monuments with Thomas Bertie. These are the Draper chantry at Christchurch and the Norton tomb at East Tisted. Each deserves a full architectural description and survey. However, there is insufficient space here to achieve that ambition, but, given the relevance of these tombs to the work described above, an outline description is given here. Additionally, the Pole chantry at Christchurch has sometimes been associated with Bertie, and something must be said about this too.

The Draper chantry in Christchurch priory

Amongst the better known of Renaissance monuments, the Draper chantry was designed and built by 1529; this date is inscribed on the work (fig. 229). For Pevsner, the monument has only 'minor Renaissance details' although he saw its connection with the screens in Winchester cathedral.[74] The Draper chantry was supposed to occupy the east end of the south aisle of the priory and Bertie created a screen to

[73] The terracotta work at Clerkenwell matches that in East Anglia, pers. comm. T. Smith, and see also his report in Sloane and Malcolm, 2004.

[74] Pevsner 1967, 34, 174-5. The description in VCH Hampshire 5, 1912, 104 is surprisingly slim by contrast with the entries for Thruxton and Sherborne St John.

enable this. In the eventuality, Draper never used it as the Reformation intervened; he died twelve years after and was buried in the nave of Christ Church.

The priory is also famous for the Pole chantry chapel (fig. 230); this was erected for Margaret Pole though she too never was buried here; political circumstances overtook her aspirations, she was executed in 1541 in the Tower of London and buried on Tower Hill. Maurice Howard dates the chapel to *c.*1520, though the evidence to support this conjecture is lacking.[75] Pevsner thought the Pole chantry post-dated Draper's and confined his opinion to suggesting the Pole monument dated to before 1541.[76] The two works are quite different in style and quite probably were designed and built by very different masons. There is some thought Bertie created this chantry chapel and this possibility is discussed below.

In tackling the commission for Prior John Draper, Bertie was confronted by much the same problem he had previously encountered in Winchester cathedral – namely, to span a space with a screen. For the most part, his response was much the same and he utilised an ornate arcade of windows pierced by a door. The basic design employed the use of the early-Tudor court style in terms of the major pieces in this work, such as the windows, the blind panelling beneath and the general outline of the door framing. We have also an unashamed inclusion of straightforward Gothic elements in the treatment of the niches that are a feature of the upper stages of the screen. The niches are capped with gables that are crocketed and cusped to their finials in a treatment that comes straight out of any Gothic stylebook. Quietly intruded amongst all of this is much surface decoration in the *all'antica* style that Bertie had adopted for his work at Sherborne St John, Thruxton and Winchester.

The most pronounced of this *all'antica* work is the frieze that runs across the top of the screen, above the inscription which itself echoes the style used on the Winchester presbytery south screens, and below a crennalated crest. The design of the frieze follows closely that used on the presbytery north screen, design 5 (fig. 231 and 232). There are minor differences, for example, the wheat-ears on the presbytery screen are omitted from the Draper frieze, but these are not especially significant in

75 Howard 2003, 57-8.
76 Pevsner 1967, 175.

their graphic terms even if the iconographic meaning is. The frieze incorporates shields set above the gabled and canopied niches; these bear the initials of the patron, John Draper, and in the centre, the abbreviation IHS for Jesus (fig. 231). These, and shields elsewhere on the screen, are clasped by cartouches similar to those we have seen at Thruxton and Winchester. Introduced here from amongst the Thruxton designs are cornucopia; they are set on the plinths beneath the north and south main statuary niches (fig.s 233 and 234). That on the north shows the super-imposed initials of JD (fig. 234) while that in the centre has ID above a depiction, we might reasonably suppose, of the priory complete with spire (fig. 233). Today, the priory has no spire which raises the question did Draper add a spire or was a spire in place at the time?[77] Or is this simply artistic licence? The north cornucopia shows a pair of horns with stacked fruit in their mouths with, emerging from behind, fronds that derive from the five-point motif that is the repeated central motif in the frieze. The central panel has a tasselled cord with, separately and either side but inverted, the same multi-point device as seen on the frieze, if here seven-point rather than five. Either end of this central panel are two further shields, these are blank but the treatment of the left-hand shield is strongly reminiscent of the Thruxton work.

This repeated use of designs, and their re-working into different shapes or changed arrangements, is demonstrated further in the spandrels above the door and over the windows (fig. 235). While the overall feel of these is much the same one from the next, the actual design of each individual piece is different in the detail. Again, the shields have cartouches, this time with fleur-de-lys present though these probably should be construed as non-heraldic. The same flower heads, bunches of fruits, volutes and other motifs that we have encountered at Thruxton are again present. The spandrels above the windows show again Draper's monogram with a floral rinceaux in the left-hand spandrels and a floral rinceaux alone in the right. The style of these echoes the 'spiky' work we have seen in the cathedral screens and which appears to emanate from Silkstede's stalls. The flower heads and leaves in these spandrels are also especially close to those included in the Thruxton work.

Lastly, the transoms in the window frames are filled with rinceaux in which the affronted slashed volutes seen in the frieze are utilised. These affront a central

77 The priory guidebook notes that there had been spire until *c.*1420 when it fell down.

'cup' with a flower and have their ball terminal tails tied together around another floral motif (figs 236 and 237).

The stringcourse carries an inscription (fig. 231) in the same script as seen on the presbytery south screen. The rear face of the screen is undecorated and the interior of the chapel appears never to have been fitted out as a chantry chapel.

The Pole chantry at Christchurch Priory

The Pole chantry chapel provides another essay in the transition between Gothic and Renaissance architecture, although here the Gothic work is simply adorned with Renaissance styling in place of Gothic decoration.[78] Indeed, the south face of the chapel and its interior show barely any trace of Renaissance work. Harvey implied in his biography of Bertie that he was responsible for the work of creating the Pole chantry as well as that for Draper, an idea that requires some exploration, but which as I shall show I find implausible.[79]

Margaret Pole was cousin to Henry VIII's mother,[80] Elizabeth of York, and was a senior member of the court. Anyone close and with a claim to the throne was held suspect by Henry VIII, thus Margaret's fate to be attainted for treason and then executed cannot have caused surprise at the time, however much historians today deprecate the fact.[81] Her Hampshire home was the nearby fortified house at Warblington, but there is no documentary evidence recording when the chantry chapel was commissioned, nor is it recorded as to who built it or what it cost.

I do not intend to offer a full description of the structure here (fig. 230) but will focus instead on the Renaissance elements.[82] *All'antica* ornament can be seen on the buttress-shafts that divide the bays of the structure and on the horizontal panels that link these together. The shafts contain sequences of stacked motifs, most of which are based on urns or vases with, interspersed amongst these, much use of floral or foliate motifs (fig. 238). Each shaft has a vertical series of motifs which

78 VCH Hampshire 5, 1912, 103; Pevsner 1967, 176; Howard 2003, 57-8.

79 Harvey 1984, 33.

80 For a detailed biography of Margaret Pole, see Pierce 2003.

81 Starkey 2004, 614 is of the view that Margaret and her family, by contemporary standards, were deserving of their fate.

82 There is no full architectural description of this chantry in print.

differs down the length but which is repeated on adjacent panels. There is a high level of symmetry about the application of these candelabra. However, while they fill the ground on which they are applied, they are otherwise unsupported by other Classically inspired motifs. There are for instance no capitals here, nor any other form of Classical decoration such as egg-and-dart or water-leaf decoration. Stylistically, this work echoes that of late Quattrocentro painters such as Carlo Crivelli, whose *Annunciation with Saint Emidius* is filled with candelabra of a similar style.

The transoms are in an entirely different idiom, one that reflects the developments of *all'antica* stylisation in the early-sixteenth century. The design shows a tri-partite layering of panels separated by a range of relatively uncomplicated, plain mouldings (fig. 238). The uppermost of these panels provides a design based on the water-leaf, which is repeated in a crest-like sequence in series with a flute-like flower head or furled leaves. One would hesitate to say categorically that these are Classically inspired as this leaf appears in Gothic work, but in the context of the sequences beneath this would appear to be the correct interpretation. The other two panels are clearly Renaissance. The central panels show a sequence of winged putto heads and urns with fruit set in an alternating sequence linked by slashed volutes and leaf-adorned cornucopia. The lowest transom carries a similarly patterned series which here comprises bunches of leaves and upturned palmettes with these linked by leafy-volutes.

An especially notable aspect of this work is its staccato repetition; all the motifs are replicas one of the next, there is no individual characterisation, no element of that playfulness of execution of motifs so that, on close inspection, as we have seen so often elsewhere, one motif differs in some slight detail from the next. It is that characteristic of difference in the detail, the non-symmetry within the overall symmetry, that so marks the frieze at St Cross and is a feature of Silkstede's stalls, and which also informed Thomas Bertie's work too.

As we have come to see, Thomas Bertie's work has a consistency of style that is recognisably his. We can observe this developing through the presbytery screens in the cathedral and then on and outwards in his work at Sherborne-St John, Thruxton and Christchurch priory (for Draper) and culminating, as far as his extant

works go, at East Tisted. The style of the work on the Pole chantry does not fit into this stylistic sequence. For sure, we should consider the potential input of the client and her requirements, and perhaps too we might want to think about dating. The client: rich, powerful and well-connected, Margaret Pole, Countess of Salisbury, was a member of Queen Katherine's household for a number of years, especially in the later 1520s during the time of the King's Great Matter.[83] Katherine, known for her devout Christianity, we can imagine encouraging her friend and companion in constructing a suitable chantry chapel; and no doubt the designs for its structure and decoration were much discussed by the two ladies.

Within the priory, tradition asserts that it was Pietro Torrigiano who designed the chapel; but this seems unlikely.[84] As this was to all intents and purposes the equivalent of a royal commission, the designer of the chantry could have been any one of the leading master masons of the day. However, until some serious work is done on profiling the mouldings and exploring the proportions of the crockets and finials, it is unlikely we can establish who was responsible with any sense of certainty. There are none of what we may suggest are Bertie's trademark designs here. And yet there is some hint in the transoms of the designs that appeared in the two cathedral friezes. The central rinceaux in the Pole transom (fig. 238) hints at the Pexall and cathedral south frieze, while the bottom rinceaux hints at the cathedral north frieze and the Lisle frieze, as well as panels in the Lisle chapel frieze that I shall describe below. Of particular interest are the palmettes which are intruded into Bertie's work in the north presbytery frieze and the Lisle frieze. The Pole chapel offers a potential source for the motif. But, when we draw back from the detail and look at the tomb in its entirety we see a florid Gothic style that has no echo of the work in the Winchester screens or the arcade of windows in the external walls of the presbytery. This, I suggest, was not the work of Thomas Bertie but he may well have seen it and have taken into his repertoire the designs we see on the transoms and used them, reconfigured and redesigned in his own work.

83 Margaret's role is explored in part in Starkey 2004.

84 The style of Torrigiano's tombwork was anyway very different, though this need not mean that the design of the Pole tomb was not, on that basis, his; on Torrigiano, Darr 1980, unpublished doctoral dissertation; on his tombs in Westminster Abbey, see Higgins 1894 and Lindley 1991; on his tomb for Dr Yonge, see Galvin and Lindley 1988.

If so, this would imply that the Pole chantry dates to the early 1520s or even the late 1510s, perhaps sometime between 1518-1522, and this, on the basis of the strength of the Gothic element in the design and the Quattrocento nature of the all'antica work, would seem the best approximation we can at present reach.

The Norton tomb in East Tisted church

Against the east wall of the south aisle of the church of St James, East Tisted, is the canopied tomb of Richard and Elizabeth Norton (fig. 239). This setting comprises a tomb chest panelled on the front, with shields set in each panel and surrounded with the now familiar Renaissance detail.

The tombs, and the arms above it, appear to have been restored at some point in the twentieth-century but it is not known to what extent these reflect the veracity of the original. The cornice of the tomb bears a painted inscription, executed in a form of black-letter script; this is now incomplete but records that the tomb was created for the Nortons. This identification is supported by the heraldry on the shields displayed on the monument.

The tomb canopy is of a four-centred arch, the underside of which is panelled with blank, cusped tracery. At the back of the canopy is a donor panel representing the Resurrection of Christ with, kneeling on the left, Richard Norton with their eight sons, and on the right Elizabeth and their ten daughters. Did they really have 18 children? There is no documentation to prove this, although in Sussex similar tomb panels carry similar depictions of children and here documentation demonstrates that this was indeed the correct numbers of children.[85] Banners above the Nortons carry inscriptions in the same black letter text: above Richard this reads, 'IHU XPE FILI DEI MISERE MEI'. The VCH description of the tomb records that the inscription above Elizabeth was then illegible;[86] this has since been restored, but is it correct? We have no way of telling if this is the case. The spandrels of the arch are filled with shields from which emerge further examples of *all'antica* work that is typical of

85 John Gunter's 1557 tomb at Racton, Sussex, has a similar donor panel and his will appears to suggest the number of children shown on the donor panel is a factual depiction; documentation provided in the church.

86 VCH Hampshire, 3, 1908, 34.

Thomas Bertie's work. On the right, the shield has the letters R N, on the left E N, these clearly for Richard and Elizabeth Norton. The cornice of the canopy has a centred large shield with two smaller ones and a further painted inscription – but we might notice that although here it is a cornice, in others of Bertie's work this was the stringcourse complete with the same style and layout of shields.[87]

The face of the tomb has three panels filled with *all'antica* detail carved around shields; the side faces of the tomb are panelled with blank tracery. The shields are filled with the family coats-of-arms of the Nortons. As with other parts of this monument, the paintwork here is of the twentieth century. The *all'antica* work (figs 239-242) is similar to that seen elsewhere amongst Bertie's work. The left and right hand panels are almost identical – but close inspection as ever reveals the differences of detail (figs 240 and 242). We may note particularly the different treatment to the finials extending above the urns and of the floral motifs set between the volutes. The central panel (fig. 241) offers a second main design: the shield is set on top of a circular medallion frame which is clasped with cartouches and with – as so often in this part of design both in rectilinear panels and also in spandrels – yet more urns. A curious aspect of this tomb is that all the shields are different in some detail, no one is the same as the next. This too is a characteristic of Bertie's work.

Above the tomb are a pair of putti who support a shield with above a mantled helm topped with a crest (fig. 243). The arms are set within, and atop, a frame that is Classical in its style, and attention must be called to one aspect of this: the treatment of the cornice upon which the putto stands. This is executed in the exact same manner as that at Thruxton, with the acanthus leaves separated by a form of palmette. This could perhaps be dismissed as co-incidence but for the presence of the panels across the front of the tomb chest. These are comparable to those used on the Pontoise tomb in the cathedral and again at Thruxton and Sherborne St John. The background designs in the left and right panels are the same, featuring urns in the diagonals linked by volutes with, at the centre of each pair, the now usual flower-

87 The inscription runs from the cornice of the canopy and then leads on the cornice of the tomb and runs around the three faces of the tomb, according to VCH 3, 1908, 34, it reads, 'Richardus Norton armiger et Elizabeth uxor ejus flia et heres Willi Retherfield ac consanguinea et una heredu Willi dawty .... de f... ele quidem Ricus obiit ... die ... Anno dni MCCCcC ... et dicta Elizabeth obiit ... die ... Anno dni MCCCCC ... Qru aiaz Piciet' de' Amen.'

pod motif. The centre panel is et on a plain, circular medallion frame with once again urns in the diagonals these set upon stands that, on close inspection, are based on the cartouches used elsewhere with these linked by extended volutes. As always with Bertie's work, there is some variation in the workmanship of the detail – note especially the treatment of the urn so that the mirror image runs through the diagonal, not the centres through vertical or horizontal. And, as usual, that little touch of imperfection, for the motifs are not placed exactly as they should be. Another feature too is that every shield is individual, none is replicated, all are different not for their content or colours but simply for their geometry.

When was this tomb erected? There is no documentation beyond that which appears on the tomb itself which seems to suggest the 1550s. According to the VCH description, Elizabeth Norton died *c.*1530 while her husband Richard died in 1556.[88] Pevsner thought a date of *c.*1540 to be appropriate.[89] Conversely, Richard Norton's will was proved 12 February 1536/7.[90] This suggests that is entirely possible that the tomb was created earlier in the 1530s, possibly before Bertie became involved in converting monastic buildings into courtier housing or working on artillery forts for the king; activities that would surely have left with him with little time to work on tomb commissions. That said, there is no reason to suppose that Bertie did not continue to build such monuments through the 1530s as some may well have been destroyed following the dissolution of the monasteries. What is perhaps more interesting is the inclusion of the donor panel featuring the kneeling Norton family. This parallels Bertie's treatment at Sherborne St John, where he created another panel at the behest of James and Jane Spyre in 1533. It is possible that these works marked a slight evolution in Bertie's work, one that would later potentially give rise to the tombs across Sussex such as the chantry at Boxgrove but more especially the tombs at Racton and Petworth. While these are unlikely to have been created by Thomas Bertie, it is feasible that they were the work of someone who had worked for Thomas Bertie on some of the projects described above, and especially so the Norton and Spyre pieces.

88 VCH Hampshire, 3, 1908, 34.

89 Pevsner 1967, 203.

90 PROB 11/26 (formerly in the Register of Cromwell)

What about Basing?

Those familiar with the funereal monuments of Hampshire will perhaps ask why the Paulet tombs in Basing church do not figure in this analysis. Here four tombs are set in pairs either side of the chancel. Each has a four-centred arch spanning the tomb with the underside of each panelled in blank tracery. The arch spandrels are filled with shields and floral rinceaux (fig. 244). Above the arches are string-courses with, at the centre of each, a shield charged with a coat-of-arms. The north pair of tombs have additionally inscriptions which provide a memorial of those buried beneath one of whom was John Paulett who died in 1492. [91] Above the southern pair of tombs is a frieze that appears to have its origins in Quattro Cento. The spandrel of the southeast tomb, that of Sir William Paulett, shows his arms surrounded by strap-work detail (fig. 245). In the south-west tomb was Sir John Paulett, the 2nd Marquis who died in 1576. The whole complex speaks of a deliberate creation of mortuary that occupied the chapels either side of the church's chancel with the most obvious aspects the four tombs of the Pauletts and their wives who died between 1488 and 1576. An appropriate date would appear, on the evidence of the use of the strap-work, to be in the 1540s or 1550s. The style of the work clearly draws on the 1520s work in the cathedral and elsewhere, especially the Pexall monument at nearby Sherborne St John, although the frieze is very much a novel introduction. Who designed and built these tombs? As so often with these works there is no documentation but it seems most unlikely that it can have been Thomas Bertie, there is nothing here of his style, though one of his apprentices or followers might have been involved.

91 VCH Hampshire, **4**, 1911, 125-6.

Chapter 14:

Thomas Bertie's chapel at Thruxton

AS NOTED in the previous chapter, the tower at Thruxton fell down sometime in the 1790s. It was rebuilt in 1801, and a plaque recording this fact appears amongst the battlements on the north side of the tower.[1] A note in one of the church register books says that the 'chantry chapel', which stood on the north side of the church, was taken down to provide materials for the 'new' tower (fig. 213).[2] Further, as I also previously noted, the tower at Thruxton is of interest for the presence of a Renaissance frieze. This has never previously been described.[3]

In its rebuilt state, the tower is of three stages and is capped with a stringcourse on which are fixed several shields, with above a frieze filled with *all'antica* motifs, and above this crennelations complete with corner pinnacles that project above, these being capped with fretted domes (figs 246, 247 and 248). All of

1 VCH **4**, 1911, 289; although difficult to read now owing to the weathering of the stone, the inscription can still be read on the north battlement of the tower and reads, 'Rebuilt A D 1801', pers. obs.

2 *Ibid*, the location of these register books is not currently known.

3 Pevsner 1967, 620-21 in his survey of the church omitted any mention of the tower.

this stonework can be shown to have come from an earlier structure, the Lisle chapel, although whether this includes all the blocks of stone in the body of the tower and the windows is a problem that will be discussed below. Was this originally the work of Thomas Bertie or his workshop? We can of course start with the instructions Mary Lisle (*d.* 1524) left her executors in her will, when she wrote '... cause to be made a chapel or an ambulatory after the plott and bargayn made by my husbonde wt my lorded of Wynchestres mason.' [4] The import of this will has been discussed in my last chapter, where I demonstrated the links between the works at Thruxton and elsewhere, and which establish why we can plausibly link Thomas Bertie to the tomb work. Does this also mean we can link him to the construction of the chapel? Mary Lisle's will certainly indicates we can but there is also physical evidence to be considered. We may also note that while we have no idea as to how the work at Thruxton progressed or was organised, it is implicit in the detail of the Lisle wills that the bishop of Winchester's mason was charged with designing and, insofar as we can be certain of this, building both the Lisle chapel and tomb. Work on the tomb and its surround are as likely to have been carried out in Bertie's workshop that was probably sited close to the cathedral in Winchester. Carved and moulded work for the chapel walls may also have been worked in the Bertie workshop in Winchester although a workshop could have been established at Thruxton for the duration of this project. Determining the sequence of work at Thruxton church is somewhat difficult. It is possible that first the new chapel was built and roofed, perhaps with a relatively flat roof covered in lead, and the wall between the chapel and the chancel was breached later in order to insert the tomb canopy and west arch of the Lisle monument with the tomb itself being added at the last.

A noticeable feature of the work that can be connected with Thomas Bertie, and which I described in previous chapters, is the absence of fantastic creatures such as we saw were a striking element of the St Cross frieze and, if less markedly so, the Silkstede frieze. Also absent are medallions with profile portraits. However, both of these are present in a quite complex design in the frieze at Thruxton. The character of this frieze is sufficiently different to warrant a closer analysis here, not only for its

[4] *Ibid.*, 389, n.66.

value as another example of *all'antica* work, but also for the light it sheds on Bertie's capacity as a designer and stonemason.

If this piece of work is different to the main group of Bertie's work, as exemplified by the Pexall and Lisle monuments, why attribute the frieze to Bertie? There is no documentation for the creation of the frieze but, by its association with the Lisle monument within the church, it seems reasonable to ascribe the vessel to the mason who created the tomb. There are other indications. On the tower stringcourses there are a number of shields bearing the Lisle heraldic achievements. The style of this work marches with that in the cathedral and, as has been noted, with that of the Pexall and Lisle tombs. Looking more closely, if we take the Lisle shield on the south face of the tower we can see the Lisle 'sunburst' motif (figs 156 and 157). The manner in which this badge is executed mirrors almost exactly another shield with the same motif in the vault of the south presbytery aisle. While the badge could represent one of Henry VII's armorial bearings (it was Edward V's and Henry used it occasionally by virtue of his marriage to Elizabeth of York) it is not inconceivable that in the cathedral it actually represents Lisle.[5] The 'who' of the shield should not however obscure the match of the workmanship, the two pieces are sufficiently close to warrant ascription to the same hand. Noticing that in the very many examples of Fox's own arms displayed in the cathedral there is absolutely no sense of consistency in which these are represented, indeed quite the opposite, which further bolsters this observation. Other fine details further reveal why this frieze should be seen as part of Bertie's work; these will be noted in the description and discussion that follows.

Three features of the tower are of interest here: the stringcourse, the frieze and the merlons and I will describe each in turn.

5 The bosses in the presbytery aisle vaults have not attracted the attention that the main vault over the presbytery has and is thus a further example of the general lack of any detailed analysis of Fox's building programme in the cathedral. The Lisle badge also appears in the main vault above the presbytery.

The stringcourse

This is a deeply moulded but relatively simple feature that is remarkably similar to that present above the external windows of Fox's presbytery arcade, and also similar to the stringcourses present in the Pexall and Lisle tomb canopies.[6] That said, the style of this work is not uncharacteristic of the period and can be seen elsewhere. However, with the presence of Bertie's hand confirmed in the work on the Lisle tomb and its surround within the church, it is reasonable to see a further connection with him through cathedral work and the stringcourse now on Thruxton church tower. It would be very useful to see a comparison of the moulding profiles as this would help to determine whether or not this piece of work was moulded by Thomas Bertie.

As has been noticed, four shields are affixed to the stringcourse; these bear the heraldic devices of the Lisle family and, on the north face of the tower, a shield with the letters T L (fig. 249).[7] Why T L? An explanation is provided by the description in VCH, which notes that one of the medallions in the frieze bears the date 1527. The medallion in question is on the east face of the tower (E5), although it would now probably pass unnoticed were it not for the VCH entry, as the frieze is somewhat eroded and obscured also by lichen (fig. 250).[8] This of course post-dates the death of both Sir John Lisle and his wife Mary, who both died in 1524. The explanation is to be found in the descent of the manor. Sir John's sister Eleanor married one John Kingston and their daughter, Mary, married a cousin of Sir John's, Sir Thomas Lisle of Wooton, and, following the death of Mary's siblings, they inherited from Sir John and Mary Lisle. Thomas (*d.* 1542) and Mary (*d.* 1539) also

6 The Thruxton stringcourse is also stylistically similar to the stringcourse on the presbytery screens but the sequence and geometry of the mouldings differ.

7 On the south face: two shields – the sunburst through clouds of Lisle and three martlets with a bar also for Lisle; on the east face, one shield – three lions for Lisle ; on the north, one shield – the letters TL linked with a cord and with a central floral motif; the west face has no shields.

8 The east frieze can be 'read' quite clearly on a sunny day in the morning when the light slants across the carved work, at other times it is difficult to make out the detail of the carving; additionally, the proximity of large trees on the east and south of the church impede views of the tower.

died childless.[9] The **T L** in the stringcourse and the date of 1527, indicate that it was Thomas and Mary Lisle who finished the construction of the Lisle chapel.

Thruxton church tower frieze

The frieze is more interesting. The blocks of carved stonework from the frieze were placed around the west, south and east sides of the tower in continuous runs of stonework, with a further two sections on the north face – the remainder of this side being formed from stone blocks cut in the eighteenth century. Several other blank sections appear on the other tower faces and these too are presumably eighteenth century insertions. Close inspection of the frieze shows that only on the south face has it been re-assembled in its original running order; on the three other sides no two blocks remains adjacent to its original matching section with the possible exception of the two medallions in blocks E8 and E9.[10] The left-hand part of block S3, a medallion with a shield, is now missing and this suggests that several blocks from the original frieze are now lost; the problem is looked at further below but I would suggest that not more than four or five are not now present.

9 Hicks 2004.

10 The blocks of carved stone in the frieze have each been given unique alpha-numeric numbers so that the letter W, S, E and N represents the tower face, east – north, while the block position is given by the number.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
West											
	blank	blank	Thx1	Thx2	Thx1	Thx1	Thx1	Thx1	Thx3	Thx4	Thx7
South											
	Thx7	Thx3	Thx4	Thx4	Thx4	Thx4	Thx4	Thx4	Thx4	Thx1	blank
East											
	blank	Thx2	blank	Thx2	Thx5	Thx2	Thx1	Thx6	Thx6	Thx1	blank
North											
	Thx1	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	blank	Thx1	blank

Table 11: Distribution of Thruxton (Thx) frieze designs around the four faces of the church tower.

The frieze is made up of rectangular blocks of stone that are bounded top and bottom by a plain, quite narrow, moulding providing a wide field that is extensively filled with detailed carving and leaving very little of the field plain or uncut. The frieze is significantly stepped-back from the stringcourse below and the crennelations below giving it a quite dramatic and graphic appearance that is emphasised by the relative lack of detail in the carving of the motifs. This is something of a contrast to some of the delicacy of detail to be seen in the carving of the work on the tomb surrounds. The graphic quality of the frieze carving may reflect its use as an external frieze where changing levels in sunlight may well have been a consideration in the design of the frieze.

Three main designs appear in the frieze, with a further four designs based on these of which one is a corner block and is now represented by only one piece (W11/S1). The majority are composed of Thx1 designs, which were also used in the

design of the Thx4 blocks. The distribution of the individual designs is shown in Table 12. This table however does not reveal the continuity of frieze sections which is only contiguous along the south face. The sections of Thx1 frieze along the west face do not present a continuous sequence of work.

Thx											total
1	W2	W5	W6	W7	W8	S10	E7	E10	N1	N9	10
2	W3	E2	E4	E6							4
3	W9	S2									2
4	W10	S4	S5	S6	S7	S8	S9				7
5	E5										3
6	E8	E9									2
7	W11/ S1										1
											29

Table 12: Thruxton church tower frieze designs by frequency and location.

Design Thx1: a double-register rinceaux design that has at its central and repeated motif a floral motif. In the centre of the design the floral motif is supported by a pair of inturned and slashed volutes with ball terminals that are repeated as an upper register along this style of the frieze. Along the lower register are pairs of curvilinear cornucopia linked with a band to the central motif. These curl outwards and round to enclose a leaf and are linked to further vertical floral motifs each of which is slightly different to the last (fig. 251). These floral motifs mirror somewhat the motifs on the Lisle tomb and also the design of the presbytery north screen frieze in Winchester Cathedral. The volutes have a 'chunky', somewhat top-heavy feel about them.

Design Thx2: this is much simpler than Thx1 and comprises a central floral motif, perhaps a stylised rose, supported by a volute-like leaf either side from which curve outwards a stalk that terminates with a fruit or husk (fig. 252). This secondary curl is linked into a second floral motif that provides the link to the repeating design, which returns to the first floral motif, the second flower having a bell like shape akin to a bluebell. Block E2 shows a pomegranate instead of a flower.

Design Thx3: provides an evolution of the Thx1 design (fig. 253). In block W9 the Thx1 rinceaux are fed from the right into a medallion that contains a blank quatrefoil shield; this is reversed in S2 where the Thx1 rinceaux are set on the left hand side of the medallion – these two sections of carving are probably matching pieces.

Design Thx4: here the central floral motif with slashed volutes is set on one side of the block and from this emerges a griffin, its tail twined into the Thx1 motif in place of the cornucopia (fig. 254). The winged griffin supports a medallion within which is a blank shield or quatrefoil. This provides the design for a continuous sequence of blocks along the south side of the tower, blocks S3 to S9, the sole remaining intact sequence of the frieze. The series provides an asymmetric sequence with the two shields on the west of the series and the two quatrefoils to the east. The griffins are quite coarsely carved with little detail but are nonetheless strongly carved with a striking graphic quality about them.

Design Thx5: the medallions seen in Thx3 and 4 is reused here but supported by the floral design seen in Thx2. Only a single block of this design can now be seen and this is E5 and this is the shield bearing the date 1527 (fig. 250).

Design Thx6: is a variation of the last design and is confined to two blocks, E8 and E9. Here design Thx1 is used to link and support a medallion that surrounds a profile portrait. Both of these portraits a quite badly weathered and further obscured by lichen but they would both seem to be male profiles (fig. 255). E8 shows a man facing right, he appears to have very little hair on his head and may have a beard, the face seems to be that of an older man. He faces a second man, on E9, who wears a helmet that may be classical in style rather than of contemporary armour; this man seems to be younger than his counterpart. It is possible that the two blocks are a matching pair but it is difficult to be certain of this.

Design Thx7: is provided by the corner block at the southwest angle of the tower, block W11/S1 (fig. 253). This shows an urn with a floral motif emerging from the top that is similar to the centre motif in the Thx1 blocks. The block has a moulding on the vertical, outside edge showing that this would originally have been a corner and that it would have marked the end of one run of the frieze.

As can be seen from table 13 the Thx1 design, with its variant Thx3, is the most prolific design present providing fourteen sections of work. The Thx2 design and its variants Thx5 and Thx6 gives seven sections of work, while the third main design, Thx4, has also seven sections. This has implications for how we might reconstruct the frieze and might additionally reveal something of the original size of the Lisle chapel. The designs themselves owe something to the style of work in the Silkstede frieze, the presence of griffins supporting central motifs alongside cornucopia being especially noteworthy. However, the 'spiky' feel that is so noticeable of the Silkstede work (figs 146-149) is not present here, while the volutes that are a feature of the Thruxton work are not to be seen in the Silkstede work. The mixture of slashed volutes and floral rinceaux echoes a similar design that appears on one of the mortuary chests in the cathedral, that of Edmund in bay S3. This similarity of design is echoed in the merlons above the frieze to which we may now turn.

The battlements

The tower is capped with a crennelated battlement with, at each corner, domed pinnacles.

Merlons. The frieze is capped with a quite ornate set of battlements, which have a simple but deep moulding that runs around both the crenels and the merlons. Although obviously derived from the medieval mouldings, these differ in the sense that these are clearly decorative rather than intended to serve a practical purpose. The merlons have a panel set in each and features a single design based on a palmate leaf (fig. 256). This design is surprisingly close to that executed on the lid end-panels of the mortuary chests, which stand on top of the presbytery screens in the cathedral. Each design has seven leaves that radiate from a semi-circular core, the mortuary

chest leaves being symmetrically exact shapes, while those at Thruxton are more curved and, perhaps, life-like. There are other fine detail parallels to be drawn between the mortuary chests and the Thruxton frieze that are sufficiently persuasive to encourage the thought that these pieces could be contemporary. This point will be discussed in more detail below.

Were the corners always intended to have longer merlons? The east face, at the SE angle, has a full panel from a merlon, plus part of a second and this might suggest that what we see here is a nineteenth-century arrangement rather than a sixteenth-century style.

Pinnacles. There are four of these, set at each corner of the tower and they all follow the same pattern (fig. 256). The two external faces are carved in imitation of blank arcading with simple, trefoil heads. These are capped with crocketed domes. Similar architectural pieces occur amongst the external work to the cathedral presbytery arcades and at Christchurch, where they surmount Draper's chantry chapel (fig. 164). The presence of just four of these pieces may not necessarily indicate that there were not more originally, nor that they were set at the corners of the battlement over the chantry chapel roof but the strong likelihood is that there originally only were four. The two blank faces might also indicate that they were originally set rotated 45^0 off the line followed by the battlement, so that the two panelled faces were presented to view. This would parallel the flying buttresses on the north side of the cathedral presbytery, which Bertie may well have been responsible for erecting in the previous decade.[11]

Other features

The description in VCH suggests the window in the west face of the tower and the door on the south may also have been transposed here from the chantry chapel. While not wholly improbable, the window at Thruxton is sufficiently different in style to those in the cathedral presbytery arcades to encourage us to question this, on the basis that if Bertie was responsible for the work here then his style of fenestration would have paralleled the application of his style of *all'antica* work. As it appears

11 On Fox's re-development of the presbytery, see my Chapter 4.

that all the other windows in the church were altered or replaced in the Victorian period, there is perhaps a case to suggest that the tower west window was similarly changed at that time. The south door, while exhibiting earlier sixteenth-century features, has no *all'antica* decorative details and is thus unlikely to have been originally associated with the chantry chapel, where all the known stonework was treated with Renaissance motifs.

Reconstructing the chapel

All trace of the original Lisle chapel has been swept away aside from the remaining tomb canopy within the church and the adjoining arch on the west (fig. 214). The site of the Lisle chapel was later partially covered by the present vestry, which was built in 1839.[12] It is possible that part of the footings for the Lisle chapel remain intact between the west wall of the vestry and the east wall of the church north aisle but it possible that the east wall of the north aisle overlies the west wall of the Lisle chantry. Therefore, it is unlikely that an archaeological excavation here would reveal much of then Lisle chapel although it might confirm the line of the chapel's north wall.

The bottom lift of the tower is 5.60 metres wide, and while the tower is somewhat narrower towards its top, this is not likely to amount to more than about half a metre. From this it is possible to suggest that there are approximately 15 to 16 metres of frieze set around the tower. Assuming that very little of the frieze has been lost – some clearly has been, as may be seen from the cut-down block S2 – and on the basis that in its original setting the frieze was a continuous feature around the upper levels of the chantry chapel walls, then it is possible to extrapolate from this and suggest the chapel was something of the order of 9-10 metres long and 3-4 metres wide. The overall measurements of the Lisle tomb, its surround, and the west arch including the west pier amount to approximately 8 metres. If the chapel walls were butted against the piers supporting the west-end of the west arch and the east end of the tomb canopy then the external wall length would have to be of an order of 9.0 metres; thus a 10-metre external wall seems potentially the most likely. The present

12 This date is given on a plaque on the north, exterior wall of the vestry.

north aisle of the church has an external width of just over 4 metres. Could this reflect anything of the original dimension of the chantry chapel? As likely as not it probably does. It is probable that the Lisle chapel comprised a rectangular structure that was attached to the north wall of the church and that the walls and roof of the new chapel did not extend higher than the pre-existing church walls. It therefore follows that the Lisle chapel had three walls of its own, the fourth being the north wall of the church. The new chapel would have had an east window and may have had a single or more windows in the north wall. Given outside dimensions of approximately 10 by 4 metres, the surviving sections of frieze would be approximately sufficient to fill two short and one long side of the chapel with friezework; there is not enough material to suggest a fourth (long) side.

The distribution and number of stone blocks carved with each type of design allows some thoughts on how this might have been arranged. The surviving continuous length of frieze on the south face of the tower, extending to perhaps four metres in length, suggests that this should be placed in the long, north wall with the remainder of this section filled with Thx1 sections. The two medallions in the Thx6 designs with extensions into Thx2 designs would have filled one of the end walls, I would suggest the date plaque of 1527 was set with these medallions and that they filled the most important section – the east face of the chapel. The four pinnacles would have been set at the corners of the chapel and it is possible that there was a partial return of the battlement above the junction of the chapel with the chancel. However, as the pinnacles have panels with tracery on only two faces it is possible there was an alternative arrangement. The north wall of the Lisle chapel might have been divided into three bays each divided by a pilaster capped by a pinnacle, with these set at a 45^0 angle mirroring the setting of the north exterior wall of the presbytery at Winchester cathedral. Is this feasible? The bays in the presbytery screen in the cathedral measure 2.40 metres between the attached pilasters, with pairs of windows some 1.15 metres wide. The external arcade of windows, along with their substantial buttresses that support the flying-buttresses above the roof line of the presbytery aisles, are of similar dimensions.

Thruxton – concluding comments

The presence of carved stonework in the tower, together with a plaque bearing a date 1527 and a shield on the stringcourse bearing the initials TL, alongside the documented information that the tower was rebuilt using material taken from the chantry chapel, indicate that the chapel itself was built or completed by Thomas Lisle rather than his cousin, Sir John Lisle, whose tomb the chapel enclosed. The sequence of work at Thruxton was clearly quite complex and carried out over a period that was possibly as long as a decade. Sir John Lisle clearly initiated the programme of work and his wife continued this. It fell to their inheritors, Thomas Lisle and his wife Mary, Sir John's niece, to complete the work. The reference in George Rogers will of 1524 to a chantry chapel at Thruxton indicates that while the Lisle tomb may not have then been completed, work on the chapel itself had been commenced.[13]

It is clear that there is a strong link between the work on the Lisle tomb and work by Thomas Bertie on the presbytery screens and elsewhere, particularly Christchurch and East Tisted. The tower frieze is less easily seen as a product of Bertie's workshop and certainly it does not fit easily amongst Bertie's tomb canopy works. This however would be to suggest that Bertie was only interested in turning out this style of work, an assumption that is probably wrong. Although the carving of the tower frieze is somewhat crude, even allowing for the damage this frieze has suffered as a result of weathering, it is obviously not of the same quality as the work on the Lisle, Pexall or other tombs with which we can associate Bertie, and while acknowledging that there are clearly mistakes in the execution, it is nevertheless possible to find clear parallels with the work in the cathedral. The most obvious is the use of the griffins. These appear on Silkstede's frieze and, I suggest, were probably the model for the Thruxton work. The style of the rinceaux also echoes Silkstede's stallwork but, more particular, is the parallel to be drawn with the presbytery screen south frieze. The overall feel of the Thruxton frieze, its rhythm and

13 Will of George Rogers, PROB 11/21 (1524).

its use of rinceaux alternating with centred motifs match the presbytery screen. More especially, the detailing of the frieze picks up something of the style of the presbytery screen bays in S3S (fig. 165).

There is also a case to be made linking the work on the mortuary chests set along the top of the presbytery screens in the cathedral and the Thruxton frieze; in particular between the end-panels and the merlons and between some of the detailing of the *all'antica* work. Further, the style of the volutes that are placed in an upper register of the frieze and used to frame floral motifs, parallels a similar style of frieze attached to the side of one of the mortuary chests in the cathedral. This is that of Edmund, which sits in bay S3; however this is one of four surviving chests (a further two chests are seventeenth century reconstructions) and the other chests have a less conspicuous affinity to the Thruxton frieze. The authorship and patronage of the chests is not known, a particular aspect being the complete lack of any motif or badge linking them to Bishop Fox.[14] In all the work identifiably connected to Fox his badge of a pelican vulning, or another of his symbols, is prominently displayed. The chests could therefore post-date Fox's episcopate but may reflect the development of the *all'antica* style following on from the creation of the Thruxton frieze. Taken together, all of this points to the Thruxton frieze having a Winchester connection, and it would therefore be surprising if the frieze was not the work of Thomas Bertie or, at the very least, a product of his workshop. Nonetheless, it is a piece of work that stands outside the main thrust of Bertie's application of the *all'antica* style which was expressed in the tomb monuments and screens created for the Lisles, Pexalls, Prior Draper and for his greatest patron, Bishop Fox.

[14] The mortuary chests are described in Biddle's survey of the early Renaissance in the cathedral, on which, see Biddle 1993, 275-78.

Chapter 15:

Conclusion

CHARTING THE COURSE OF BRINGING the Renaissance to early Tudor England is compounded by the twin difficulties of limited documentary sources and uncertain dating. Added to this is an intellectual scepticism that suggests the early usage of *all'antica* ornament was nothing more than an insignificant and temporary fashion. Such would certainly explain the extraordinary situation that obtained at a recent exhibition, *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, at the V & A. This was notable for the irony of its opening exhibits, all of which were emphatically Renaissance and the absolute antithesis of Gothic art. Thus the second exhibit, Holbein's pen and ink drawing of Henry VII and Henry VIII, was utterly devoid of any element of Gothic art, with this swiftly followed by an image of the great hall at Hampton Court. Yes indeed, here a wonderful hammerbeam (therefore Gothic) roof, but what of the 'antik' spandrels? And why should Thomas Johnson of London necessarily, as Wilson asserts, have come from the Netherlands?[1] The early Tudor Renaissance was distinguished by its absence from this display which, to my mind, made something of a mockery of the exhibition title. There was, for example, nothing representative of the terracotta that was a striking feature of the artistic endeavour of the period, whether in the form of the medallions at Hampton Court and elsewhere or the architectural terracotta that featured in many high status buildings erected between 1515 and *c.* 1540, such as that at Sutton Place.

[1] Catalogue entry for item 4 written by Christopher Wilson at p.148 and see plate at p. 281, in Marks and Williamson 2003.

The use of *all'antica* work in southern England can be dated with some certainty from at least the earlier 1520s – the work in Winchester cathedral, the Lisle monument at Thruxton and that of Lord Marney in terracotta at Layer Marney all offering well-dated examples of the early style. Thus the *all'antica* work on the 1532-4 roof at Hampton Court mentioned earlier can readily be understood to follow an established English pattern. And this perhaps is really the point. The fashion for and acceptance of the *all'antica* style was very clearly established during the 1520s with, as I have demonstrated above, some of the earliest work belonging to the years before 1520. It was nevertheless a fusion of fashions, in some instances such as the Hampton Court hammerbeam roof, the Gothic reality has been clad with *all'antica* fantasy but, by way of contrast, in the case of the St Cross frieze it is Classical rectilinearity that predominates with ogee arches and finials the only nod to a passing style.

The Hampton Court roof illustrates the tension of applying a new art form, although this is perhaps something of a special case. The palace had been Thomas Wolsey's magnificent creation, one that was built with spectacular speed and embraced all the latest fashions including a strong element of Italianate *all'antica* work executed through the medium of terracotta. When Henry VIII took over the palace, he instigated a programme of remodelling and reworking that sought to excise all trace of Wolsey's earlier presence – a programme that was doubtless closely scrutinised by Anne Boleyn who nurtured an especial hatred of Wolsey. The further remodelling of the palace also took place in the context of the resolution of the king's 'great matter', his divorce from Katherine of Aragon, alongside the onset of the reformation and the dissolution of the monasteries. Italianate art, especially in the form of (un-English) terracotta moulded with *all'antica* decoration was decidedly out of favour – 'uncool' in the vernacular of today – in this political climate. The great hall at Hampton Court was therefore a return of a distinctly conservative, English, style that was emphatically not Italian and not Classical – it was ironically also a return to the style of hall that Henry's and Wolsey's predecessor, Giles Daubeny,[2] had built complete with cellars and oriel window at Hampton Court.[3]

2 On Daubeny's Hampton Court, see Thurley 2003.

This change in the political climate, one that was moreover accompanied by an increasingly paranoid and vicious king, occurred at the same time as a falling off in the use of *all'antica* decoration. It seems reasonable to conclude from this that the two are distinctly linked but, given the paucity of well-researched material alongside the losses that must have resulted from the dissolution of the monasteries, it should be seen as a qualified conclusion. Even so, it is not possible to demonstrate a contiguous sequence of work that leads on from either the stone cut *all'antica* work in Hampshire or the moulded *all'antica* work in the tombs of East Anglia into new work created in the 1530s and 1540. That said, there is a tenuous linkage between tombs in Hampshire and those in Sussex such as those at Petworth, and Racton and the chantry for the de la Warrs at Boxgrove, a point I will discuss further below. I should mention here that I can see no case to link the Winchester College frieze to this series of work; it is to my mind illustrative of a short-lived fashion that is closely connected to the court of Philip II of Spain and which manifested itself in England for a few years following his marriage to Mary Tudor.[4]

The frieze at St Cross is itself something of a special case in the sense that it is apparently the only one of its kind in England. Further, if there are no direct analogues to the St Cross frieze, there are additionally very few pieces of work that can be said to be directly derivative of the frieze.[5] The Silkstede frieze in Winchester cathedral, while offering a derivative of the St Cross work, is nevertheless effectively an inferior piece, being less ably carved and poorly designed. Moreover, Silkstede's frieze draws but little from the assemblage of motifs in the St Cross work and additionally includes new material from an unknown outside source – these being the motifs on the pilasters. As I have shown, the nearest parallel to the St Cross frieze is the craftsmanship displayed in the stalls created for Cardinal d'Amboise's house

3 Wilson suggests these were added by Henry VIII, Marks and Williamson 2003, 148. The oriel window used in Henry's hall was actually created for Wolsey but never set into a building, on which see Foyle 2002, and the rebuttal in Ford and Turner 2004.

4 The frieze is described in Lewis 1995 and see my own comments on this frieze and its connection to mid sixteenth century Spanish *all'antica* work in Riall 2005.

5 One parallel is provided by a series of medallions which used to adorn the church at Staunton on Wye, Herefordshire. These were stolen from the church some years ago but had been photographed previously and these are displayed in the church. The medallions had even then been displaced from their original setting so that while the medallions are carved in the same style as those at St Cross we cannot now say how they were displayed or surrounded by other material.

at Gaillon. There is a case to suggest that the St Cross frieze might have been crafted in France and it is equally possible that even if it was made in England that the craftsmen were French who, having made the frieze, returned to the continent without executing any further work in England. Both models have merit and both can be compared with similar artistic endeavours elsewhere in England: Torrigiano's royal tombs in Westminster abbey and Giovanni da Maiano's casting of terracotta medallions (and perhaps other terracotta work) at Hampton Court for Thomas Wolsey.[6] In both cases, Italian artists were induced to travel to England to create prestigious pieces of work for elite members of the nation. We can see a similar process in the making of glass for Lord Sandys chapel of the Holy Ghost in Basingstoke and, earlier, the employment of Bernard Flower to produce glass in a Netherlandish style as at Westminster, Cambridge and Winchester. I suggest therefore that we should see the St Cross frieze in a similar light: the product of craftsmen who were employed for this one specific project. We could therefore see in the St Cross frieze an example of imported work executed by imported craftsmen. But the more important point was that it served to establish a taste for the *all'antica* style, one that men in positions of power and influence could feel comfortable in utilising as they were themselves following the example set by their leaders in the political and ecclesiastical world: men such as Richard Fox, Thomas Wolsey, Charles Brandon and Henry Marney.[7] Before leaving the St Cross frieze, it may be noted that it represents a final development of one form of the Franco-Italian premier Renaissance style. In other words, it marked the final evolution of what was essentially a French style that predominated in Rouen and at Gaillon. On this basis, I suggest that it is probably not surprising that the St Cross frieze has so few derivatives in England, a situation echoed in the work of both Torrigiano and da Maiano.

6 Simon Thurley suggests the medallions at Hampton Court were imported, Thurley 2003, caption to fig. 24 on p. 25. There is a surprisingly limited literature on these medallions and the best remains Higgins 1894. Along with Terry Smith, the building materials specialist with the Museum of London Specialist Services, I doubt the medallions were imported and suspect they were manufactured locally to Hampton Court.

7 Brandon's London house at Southwark was embellished with architectural terracotta, on which see Green 1985; Marney's house and tomb at Layer Marney in Essex have not been the subject of a detailed, published survey but see Gotch 1901 and Morris 2000 for the house and Baggs 1968 on the tomb.

While the frieze at St Cross offered one distinctive form of the *all'antica* style, the introduction of the frieze for Silkstede and, more importantly, the development of the style as seen in the cathedral presbytery screens and in tomb settings across Hampshire reveal a different form of the *all'antica* style and a change in the manner in which it was applied. One of the more notable aspects of this change is the omission of medallions and fantastic creatures.[8] There are only a very few medallions featuring portrait profiles (three in Silkstede's frieze and two in the Lisle frieze at Thruxton). My detailed analyisis of this *all'antica* work reveals a strong homogeneity about the work, one that has not been previously recognised and even, to an extent, that was denied by previous observers who declined to link the frieze along the south presbytery screen in the cathedral with that along the north screen. A second aspect to emerge from this analysis was the compelling argument favouring the attribution of this work to Thomas Bertie. Both conclusions emerge from a comprehensive survey of *all'antica* work across southern England. This underlines the argument I outlined in Chapter 3, where I showed that one of the problems with understanding the extent and success of the introduction of the style in the early Tudor period was the lack of detailed surveys such as we have for earlier, Gothic, work.

While it is my contention that it was Thomas Bertie who was responsible for carving the *all'antica* work in the cathedral – and on the monuments at Sherborne St John, Thruxton, Christchurch and East Tisted – there is no documentary evidence that establishes this beyond doubt. We know from the documentary record that Bertie was working in the cathedral in the early 1530s and that later in the decade he was converting monastic buildings into houses for the gentry as well as building forts by royal commission. The documentary record also reveals that Bertie was resident in Winchester before 1517 when his son, Richard, was born. These slim strands of evidence, combined with some monograms to be seen on the south presbytery frieze provide the basis for naming the authorship of this *all'antica* work. To this, we can add the oblique references by both John and Mary Lisle to the unnamed bishop of Winchester's mason – in their wills of 1524 – who was to build

[8] In the East Anglian terracotta many of the St Cross motifs continued in use, but without portrait medallions.

their monument having previously provided a construction estimate (the *bargayn*) and drawn up a plan (the *plott*) for it. There is no documentary record for work in the cathedral during Fox's episcopate, any such materials having long since vanished. So that while there remains a possibility that Thomas Bertie was not the mason in question, I would suggest that the balance of probability is such that it is unlikely that the mason was anyone else and that, in the absence of identifying documentary records, Thomas Bertie is the best answer we can presently provide to the question as to whom was Bishop Fox's mason.

The style of work executed by Thomas Bertie and his workshop is not illustrative of a detailed knowledge of Classical architecture or indeed of Classical styles. It was rather an application that seems to be based upon ideas that had already been expressed in an intermediate work, for example, title pages from and miniature illustrations in printed books, or from the frames of paintings or other devotional objects such as altar pieces. It is entirely conceivable that Bishop Fox might have possessed such books or art works or that Bertie was able to see such materials in the possession of men such as Wolsey or Sherborne. Bertie may even have had the opportunity to see work in progress on the terracotta work at Hampton Court and it is not inconceivable that he might have met Giovanni da Maiano in the process. Bertie may also have had access to Florence and Florentine artwork through the direct trading contacts between Bishop Fox and his bankers, Cavalcanti and Bardi, who supplied Fox with silk for one of his copes.[9] Other materials may have flowed to Winchester from Florence, and we might speculate that amongst these could have been objects such as majolica plates and other ceramics, these carrying with them a vocabulary of Classical motifs that carvers and artists such as Bertie could apply in their own work.

Here however we have to recollect the chantry chapel built for Margaret Pole. This incorporated the palmette device that is of particular interest amongst Bertie's work but is otherwise a very different creation from Bertie's tomb-work and chapels. The Pole chantry is undated but its *all'antica* decorative work has a Quattrocento feel about it, a style that is more in tune with Torrigiano's work than with the more

[9] Pers. comm. Professor Cinzia Sicca, University of Pisa, who is preparing for publication a paper on fragments of Bishop Fox's cope now preserved at Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

vivacious Franco-Italian of Gaillon and St Cross. Richard Fox was an executor for both Margaret Beaufort and for Henry VII and as such was involved in the selection of Torrigiano to design and build their tombs and in overseeing these projects. It is thus possible that Bertie may have seen Torrigiano's work for himself and indeed could have met the Italian sculptor. Margaret Pole may similarly have seen both of the Westminster tombs and have similarly met Torrigiano through her position as a close friend of the queen, Katherine of Aragon. It is feasible that Torrigiano designed, in part, the Pole chantry but it seems highly improbable he actually built it. Nor do I believe it was the work of Bertie. It is however entirely conceivable that while Bertie either had access to Torrigiano and, or, his work at Westminster, there remains a possibility that Bertie witnessed the creation of the Pole chantry and was able to utilise some of its decorative content in his own work. It is necessary to highlight 'some' as it is clear that the vocabulary used in Bertie's work is far more extensive than that in the Pole chapel – thus the Pole chapel can only offer a partial answer to Bertie's source materials. These, as I indicated above, must ultimately be the now anonymous and unidentifiable materials such as the printed page.

Bertie's *all'antica* work has a certain austerity about it, a lack of frivolity that is best explained by the lack of putti or of fantastic creatures, although both appeared as important elements of the style in the window glass of the Holy Ghost chapel. There is no sense of whimsy here; no wondrous imagining that dangled impossible motifs from the slightest of settings. Bertie's sense of the fashion was a sober execution, somewhat conservative and distinctly un-showy. This would befit the settings he was working on and, in all probability, would have accorded with the conservative taste of his patrons – leading county gentry alongside a bishop who himself cannot be described as an overly enthusiastic patron of the new style.

This study has been mainly concerned with the Renaissance style and I have not pursued the architectural activities of Thomas Bertie in any detail other than to outline some aspects of his career and to explore in detail only those facets of his work that incorporated *all'antica* detail. Bertie probably did not belong to the first rank of masons, or working builders, of this period. He was no Vertue or Morton or Coke, all of whom worked for both the crown and for Bishop Fox as the leading men in charge of major building work – Humphrey Coke being a master carpenter who

was entirely capable of running a major building works as can be seen from the work he supervised for Bishop Fox during the building of Fox's college, Corpus Christi. Bertie would seem to have been a builder of the second rank, more than capable of large works – he after all appears to have been the master mason left in charge of building artillery forts along the Solent in the 1540s, although he would have been given elaborate architectural drawings for these. Similarly his work at Titchfield appears to have been that of executing a design prepared by someone else – in this case Sir Richard Lee.[10] But that said, I suggest Bertie was himself capable of designing and drawing up plans for architectural work, as may be seen from the comment in Mary Lisle's will when she explains her wishes for the execution of her husband's instructions, 'cause to be made a Chapell or an ambulatory after the plott and bargayn made by my husbonde wt my lorde of Wynchestre's mason'. While it is probable that Bertie was continually occupied up until *c.*1517-20 with work on the exterior fabric of cathedral presbytery aisles and their vaults, there is a possibility that through the 1520s his workload in the cathedral would have been much lighter as there were no major works undertaken here, aside from the fitting of the presbytery screens. Some of his time would have been occupied with the building of the Lisle chapel at Thruxton and possibly also a chapel for the Pexalls at Sherborne St John, and with the installation of the tombs and canopies within these chapels for both families. These cannot have occupied his full attention, and it may be that he was involved also in other major projects such as rebuilding the south transept at Netley abbey. Nonetheless, it remains the case that there are probably other building projects with which Bertie was involved and which remain to be identified.

The early Tudor fashion and appetite for *all'antica* faded in the 1530s with new architectural projects of the later 1530s having a very chaste, clean appearance that is largely devoid of decorative content. Wrothesley's house, built by Thomas Bertie, from the monastic buildings of Titchfield abbey, has no *all'antica* ornament and such ornament as there is can be deemed Gothic. The contrast with Abbot Chard's lodgings at Forde abbey, built only a few years previously, can hardly be more acute. There are no clear reasons for this general abandonment of the *all'antica* style. Although it apparently persisted in the south-west and can be seen in choir

10 Harvey 1984, 32; Hare 1999, 17-21.

screens especially across Devon, and in a series of later bench ends, elsewhere the style can be shown to have been abandoned. In East Anglia the last of the *all'antica* ornamented tombs appears to date to the early 1530s while in Hampshire Bertie's tomb for the Norton's seems to be of a similar date. Therefore, it was not just terracotta as a media that was abandoned (and we may note in passing that architectural terracotta applied to domestic buildings was also abandoned in the 1530s) but *all'antica* as a style – but with one important exception, a series of tombs in Sussex.

All across Sussex are a series of tombs that are linked by several characteristics, foremost of these being the presence of putti such as those at Petworth and Boxgrove. These are lumpen, ungainly creatures and not at all the graceful and nubile creatures that swarm over Italian paintings and French carvings but they are nonetheless Renaissance putti. The putti are accompanied by other Renaissance details but the tombs are nevertheless re-worked Gothic structures that incorporate a range of Gothic elements, such as distinctive cresting, alongside Renaissance detail, as for example at West Wittering. An intriguing and possibly crucial element of many of these tombs is a panel that stands beneath the canopy arch and typically shows the risen Christ flanked on either side by members of the family for whom the tomb was erected. These seem to echo the work of Thomas Bertie who carved similar panels, one above the south door at Sherborne St John, and the other in the Norton tomb at East Tisted. The combination of these panels and Renaissance detail re-appearing in the 1540s seems to me to suggest the possibility that these were carved by a mason who had trained in Thomas Bertie's workshop.

Appendix 1

Extract from the expense accounts for works at Gaillon: the chapel woodwork.

The following is extracted from A. Deville (1850) *Comptes De Dépenses de la Construction du Château de Gaillon*, Paris, 391-95, and is from the 1508-09 account. This extract reveals that work on outfitting the chapel with a suite of stalls and associated woodwork began in December 1508 and this was still ongoing when the account closes (the end of September 1509, Michael mass). The 1509-10 account has not survived. Later accounts, for 1517-18, show that further payments totalling *100l.* were made for woodwork at Gaillon and this has been taken to suggest that the stallwork was not created until then.[1] This, the 1508-09 account shows a huge amount of work having been undertaken in that year, and we might surmise that the 1509-10 account would have revealed this scale of working continuing until Georges d'Amboise's death. When it is all taken together, the accounts given here indicate that the stalls must have been substantially finished by September 1509.

I have given Arabic numerals here rather than the original Roman, capitalized the months and transcribed the various spellings of bois (boiz, boys) as bois. Otherwise this is an exact copy of Deville's transcript. The currency denominations are livres (*l.*), sous (*s.*) and derniers (*d.*); these were subdivided as follows: 1 livre = 20 sous; 1 sou = 12 derniers.[2]

I have also shown Deville's pagination, so that the page in Deville's *Comptes de Gaillon* is shown at the start of the transcript given here ----- **p. 391** etc..

---

1 Vasselot, 1927, 324.

2 On the currency, see Knecht 1994, xx-xxi.

Bois et Menuiserie pour le Chapelle

---------- **p. 391**

~ A maistre Richart Carpe, menusier, pour 6 jours qu'il a esté de Gaillon à Rouen pour acheter du bois[3] pour la chapelle, par quictance du 3 Décembre 1508,[4] 45*s.*

---------- **p. 392**

~ A 9 menusiers, pour leurs peines d'avoir travaillé aux chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 9 Décembre 1508, 10*l.* 11*s.* 4*d.*

~ A Richart de Laplace, pour 15 pieces du bois pour servir à la chapelle aux chaires, par quictance du 11 Décembre 1508, 18*l.*

~ A Pierre Cornedieu, pour plusiers pieces de bois pour les chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 7 Décembre 1508, 37*l.* 10*s.*

~ A Richart Carpe, pour plusiers jours qu'il a vacquez, et deux autres compaignons à querir du bois pour les chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 29 Novembre 1508, 4*l.*

~ A Jehan Deschamps et 3 compaignons, pour avoir charié et porté du bois des Augustins sur le port à Rouen, par quictance du 28 Novembre 1508, 10*s.*

~ A Jehan Cochon et ses compaignons, pour avoir mis hors des Augustins et porté au bateau 75 pièces de bois, 18*s.* 8*d.*

~ A 10 menusiers, pour avoir besongné aux chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 16 Décembre 1508, 12 *l.* 8*s.*

~ A 11 menusiers, pour avoir besongné aux chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 23 Décembre 1508, 7*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.*

~ A 14 menusiers, *id.* *id.*, du 6 Janvier, 15*l.* 17*s.*

~ A 16 menusiers, *id.* *id.*, du 14 Janvier, 19*l.* 1*s.*

~ A eulx, *id.* *id.*, du 20 jour de Janvier, 15*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*

---

[3] bois is given in Deville's transcript as variously: bois, boiz, boys. I have written this as bois throughout here.

[4] In the original account, this is given as V^{c} huit.

~ A Cardin de Marbeuf, chandelier, pour 54 livres et demie de chandelle de suif à 18*d.* livres baillées aux menusiers durant les moys de Décembre derniers passés, par quictance du premier Fevrier, *4l.* 1*s.* 9*d.*

~ A 14 menusiers, pour avoir besongné aux chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 29 Janvier, 11*l.* 2*s.*

~ A eulx, *id.* *id.*, du 4 Fevrier, 13*l.* 16*s.* 2*d.*

~ A eulx, *id.* *id.*, du 11 Fevrier, 16*l.* 19*s.*

~ A eulx, *id.* *id.*, du 18 Fevrier, 17*l.* 1*s.*

~ A 17 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 24 Fevrier, 20*l.* 5*s.* 10*d.*

--------- **p. 393**

~ A 4 chartiers, pour avoir amené du port aux pierres du bois envoyé de Paris pour le chapelle, par quictance du 25 Fevrier 1508, *6l.* 6*s.*

~ A Guillaum de la Haye, voicturier, pour avoir amené en son basteau du bois pour les chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du dernier Fevrier 1508, *14l.*

~ A Thibault Roze, pour 6 peaulx de parchemin velin pour faire les ourtraicts des chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du dernier Fevrier 1508, 15*s.*

~ A 23 menusiers, poir avoir travaillé aux chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 4 Mars 1508, 22*l.* 3*s.* 4*d.*

~ A Hector Geneteau, pour bois et colle qu'il a livré pour les chaires, par quictance du 5 jour de Mars, 7*l.* 1*s.* 4*d.*

~ A Jehan Dubois, pour plusiers pieces de bois qu'il a livrez, par quictance 12 Janvier 1508, 8*l.* 16*s.*

~ A 23 menusiers, pour avoir besongné aux chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 11 Mars 1508, 27*l.* 5*s.*

~ A Nicolas Goerget, pour 60 pieces de bois d'Yylande, pour 4^{c} [IIII^{c}] de colle que autres fraiz, par quictance du 13 Mars 1508, 19*l.* 3*s.* 5*d.*

~ A Bardin, voicturier par eaue, pour avoir amené de Rouen au port aux pierres plusiers pieces de bois et colle, 35*s.*

~ A 22 menusiers, pour avoir besongné aux chaires, par quictance du

18 Mars 1508, 25*l.* 17*s.*

~ A 10 marchans de merrien,pours lusiers pieces de bois et aiz livrez à plain declarez en une inventaire, par quictance du 19 jour de Fevrier 1508, viii^{xx} 4*l.* 15*s.*

~ A Nicolas Castille, pour plusiers pieces de bois declarez en une inventaire, par quictance du 23 Mars 1508, 18*l.*

~ A 19 menusiers, pour avoir travaillé de leur d. mestier aux chaires de la chapelle, par quictance du 25 Mars 1508, 21*l.* 17*s.*

~ A 20 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du dernier Mars, 19*l.* 5*s.* 3*d.*

~ A 21 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 6 avril 1508 avant Pasques, 17*l.* 10*s.* 4*d.*

--------- **p. 394**

~ A 18 menusiers, pour avoir besongné de leur d. mestier aux chaires et marquterie de la chapelle, par quictance du 15 Avril 1509 après Pasques, 10*l.* 2*s.*

~ A 23 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 21 Avril 1509, 24*l.* 18*s.* 9*d.*

~ A 20 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 29 Avril, 30*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*

~ A eulx, *id.* *id.*, du 6 May, 16*l.* 4*s.*

~ A 21 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 13 May, 23*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.*

~ A eulx, *id.* *id.*, du 19 May, 21*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.*

~ A Robert de Vaulx, ung cent de bois rouge pour servir à la marqueterie, par quictance du 12 May, 13*s.* 6*d.*

~ A 19 menusiers, pour avoir besongné aux chaires et marquterie de la chapelle, par quictance du 27 May 1509, 27*l.* 11*s.* 9*d.*

~ A 14 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 3 Juing, 8*l.* 19*s.*

~ A 21 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 10 Juing, 20*l.* 18*s.* 2*d.*

~ A 20 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 17 Juing, 21*l.* 15*s.* 2*d.*

~ A Binet Leroy, pour 24 livres de colle, 30*s.*

~ A 2 menusiers, pour 2 voyages qu'ilz ont vacquez et charché par Paris du bois pour la chapelle, par quictance du 18 Juing 1509, 70*s.*[5]

---

[5] This (LXX^{s}) is as it is in Deville, though why it has not been reduced to 3*l.* 10*s.* is unclear.

~ A 4 menusiers demourans à Paris, pour bois qu'ilx ont vendu et livré pour le menuserye de la chapelle, par quictance du 18 Juing, IIII^{xx} 5*l.*

~ A 22 menusiers, pour avoir besongné à la menuserye et marqueterye de la chapelle, par quictance du 24 Juing, 27*l.*

~ A 23 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 8 Juillet, 44*l.* 1*s.* 3*d.*

~ A eulx, *id.* *id.*, du 15 Juillet, 28*l.* 0*s.* 8*d.*

~ A 21 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 22 Juillet, 23*l.* 17*s.*

~ A 2 menusiers demourans à Paris, pour 12 poitraulx membrures bois rouge et jaulne, par quictance du 24 Juillet 1509, 29*l.* 15*s.*

~ A 19 menusiers, pour avoir travaillé à la menuserye et marqueterie de la chapelle, par quictance du 29 Juillet 1509, 14*l.* 15*s.* 8*d.*

--------- p. 395

~ A 20 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 5 August, 16*l.* 0*s.* 4*d.*

~ A 21 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 11 August, 17*l.* 1*s.* 10*d.*

~ A 21 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 19 August, 16*l.* 0*s.* 4*d.*

~ A eulx, *id.* *id.*, du 26 August, 20*l.* 1*s.* 3*d.*

~ A 17 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 2 Septembre, 13*l.* 7*s*

~ A 2 sieurs d'aiz, pour avoir syé les abloz et acoutouers, des chaires, par quictance du 9 aoust, 31*s.*[6] 6*d.*

~ A Guillaume de la Haye, voicturier par eaue, pour avoir amené à deux voyages de Paris au port aux pierres le bois qu'il fallu à faire les chaires, cloisons et acoutouers de la chapelle, par quictance du 2 septembre 1509, 11*l.*

~ A 19 menusiers, pour avoir besongné à la menuserie et marquterie de la chapelle, par quictance du 8 septembre 1509, 19*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

~ A 25 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 16 Septembre, 25*l.* 4*s.*

~ A 27 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 23 Septembre, 28*l.* 1*s.* 10*d.*

~ A 30 menuisiers, *id.* *id.*, du 29 Septembre, 30*l.* 19*s.* 2*d.*

---

66 Deville gives this figure as XXXI^{s}.

Table A shows the amounts paid to the menusiers and at what date and reveals that some 822*l.* 18*s.* and 9*d.* was expended on their labour, with some 350*l.* expended on materials, leaving a sum of about 280*l.* that was absorbed by various other expenditures including cartage, portage and other fees. Of particular interest are the references to Irish oak (13 March), the payment to Thibault Roze for making some drawings for the chairs of the chapel (February), the specific references to marquetry work from April; red wood for the marquetry work (12 May), and the reference to twelve '*poitraulx membrures bois rouge et jaulne*' (29 July) – could these be the twelve still-existing marquetry panels that feature the sibyls and vitues?

Date 1508-09	Number of menusiers	*livres*	*sous*	*derniers*
9 Dec	9	10	11	4
16 Dec	10	12	8	0
23 Dec	11	7	15	6
6 Jan	14	15	17	0
14 Jan	16	19	1	0
20 Jan	16	15	7	6
29 Jan	14	11	2	0
4 Feb	14	13	6	2
11 Feb	14	16	19	0
18 Feb	14	17	1	0
24 Feb	17	20	5	10
4 Mar	23	22	3	4
11 Mar	23	27	5	0
18 Mar	22	25	17	0
25 Mar	19	21	17	0
31 Mar	20	19	5	3
6 April	21	17	10	4
15 April	18	10	2	0
21 April	23	24	18	9
29 April	20	30	6	8
6 May	20	16	4	0
13 May	21	23	11	6
19 May	21	21	6	8
27 May	19	27	11	9
3 June	14	8	19	0
10 June	21	20	18	2
17 June	20	21	15	2
24 June	22	27	0	0
8 July	23	44	1	3
15 July	23	28	0	8
22 July	21	23	17	0
29 July	19	14	15	8
5 August	20	16	0	4
11 August	21	17	1	10
19 August	21	16	0	4
26 August	21	20	1	3
2 Sept	17	13	7	0
8 Sept	19	19	2	6
16 Sept	25	25	4	0
23 Sept	27	28	1	10
29 Sept	30	30	19	2
		806	327	141
41 entries	Min: 9 - Max: 30	822	18	9

Table A: menusiers working at Gaillon and amounts paid.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations

Archaeol J	Archaeological Journal
BL	British Library
CSP(S)	*Calendar of State Papers (Spanish)*, vol III, (ed) Rawdon Brown (London, 1873)
CSP(Sf)	*Calendar of State Papers (Spanish)*, further supplement, (ed) G. Mattingly (London, 1947)
HRO	Hampshire Record Office
L&P	*Letters and Papers Illustrative of English History* (various vols, as given)
ILN	Illustrated London News
NMR	National Monuments Record
ODNB	Oxford Dictionary of National Biography (2004), entries downloaded from www.oxforddnb.com/view
PRO	Public Record Office (National Archives)
Post Med Archaeol	Journal of the society of *Post Medieval Archaeology*
Proc Hampsh Field Club Archaeol Soc	*Proceedings of the Hampshire Field Club and Archaeological Society* (now *Hampshire Studies.*)
RCHM	Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England
WINCM	Winchester City Museums (archival materials)

Primary sources (original documents)

BL Harleian MS 1616 f51; Baigent papers relating to St Cross

BL Add. MS 39976 ii f.422^{v}; Baigent papers relating to St Cross

HRO 111M94W, H6/5, 6 and 8: drawings of wall paintings in St Cross by Francis Baigent

HRO 111M94W E1/11; letter from Thomas Jackson RA to the committee of St Cross, dated 1924

HRO 111M94W/X2/14; composite section through the east end of the church of the Hospital of St Cross drawn by C. F. Porden and engraved by I. Le Keux, 1 December 1818

HRO Top Winchester 2/140/4; view into the chancel of the church of the Hospital of St Cross seen from the Morning Chapel, drawn by F Mackenzie and engraved by S Rawle for Britton's *Chronological History of English Architecture,* 1 Sept 1819.

HRO Top 343/2/124; watercolour of interior of the church of St Cross by Brough

NMR A/36/815; C45/1263; and general collection of photographs for Church of St Cross, Winchester.

PRO Will of Richard Norton PROB 11/26 (1537)

PRO Will of Ralph Pexsall (*sic* Pexall) PROB 11/27 (1538)

PRO Will of Nicholas Lisle PROB 11/15 (1506)

PRO Will of John Lisle PROB 11/21 (1524)

PRO Will of Mary Lisle PROB 11/21 (1524)

PRO Will of Thomas Lisle PROB 11/29 (1542)

PRO Will of George Rogers PROB 11/21 (1524)

St Peter and St Paul, Thruxton: The Memorials. NADFAS Survey 1997-98, Thruxton church archives.

Vyne Ante-Chapel window heraldry, survey P. Ayres, 1980, National Trust archive at The Vyne, Hampshire

Winchester Museum Service: Jackson, W. H., 1961, *Marwell Manor: A Brief Sketch,* unpublished typescript in WMS archive. Whinney, R., undated, *Marwell Manor: a Survey,* unpublished typescript in WMS archive

WINCM : A557, engraving of Silkestede's chapel and south transept drawn by Owen Carter and engraved by John Le Keux before 1830

Primary sources (printed)

Allen, P. S. and H. M. 1929, *Letters of Richard Fox, 1486-1527*, Oxford

Kipling, G. (ed), 1990, Anonymous: *The Receyt of the Lady Kateryne*, Early English Text Society, 296, London

Batten, E. C. 1889, *The Register of Richard Fox while bishop of Bath and Wells (1492-4)*, privately printed

Brewer, J. S. *et al* 1862-1932, *Letters and Papers. Foreign and Domestic of the reign of Henry VIII*, 21 vols, London

Deville, A. 1850, *Comptes De Dépenses de la Construction du Château de Gaillon*, Paris

Kipling, G. W. 1892, *Compotus Rolls of the Obedientiaries of St Swithun's Priory, Winchester*, Winchester

Page, M. 1996, *The Pipe Roll of the Bishopric of Winchester 1301-2*, Winchester

Ward, G. R. M. 1843, *The Statutes of Corpus Christi College, All Souls' College and Magdalen College*, London

Theses and dissertations

Darr, A P, 1980, *Pietro Torrigiano and his Sculpture for the Henry VII Chapel, Westminster Abbey*, unpubl PhD thesis, New York University

Jonathan Foyle, 2003, 'An Archaeological Reconstruction of Thomas Wolsey's Hampton Court Palace' 2003, unpubl. PhD thesis University of Reading

Gill, M. J. 1992, *A French Maecenas in the Roman Quattrocento: The Patronage of Cardinal Guillaume D'Estouteville (1439-1483)*, unpubl PhD thesis, Princeton University

Green, C. 1985, *Finds from the Site of Suffolk Place, Southwark*. unpubl Mus Dipl diss

Liou, E Y-L 1997, *Cardinal Georges D'Amboise and the Château de Gaillon at the Dawn of the French Renaissance*, unpubl PhD Thesis, Pennsylvania State University

Morscheck, C. R. 1978, *Relief Sculpture for the façade of the Certosa di Pavia, 1473-1499*. printed PhD thesis, Garland Publishing, New York and London

Smith, A. 1988a, *The Life and Building Activity of Richard Fox, c1447-1528*, unpubl PhD thesis, University of London

Secondary sources

Abbott, S. 2001, 'William Butterfield and the Hospital of St Cross, Winchester', *Ecclesiology Today*, **16**, 2-7

Adams, J., Condon, P., Heathford, T. R., Magnuson, K. J., Reeder, J. C., and Rodda, J. M., 1980, *Ornament and architecture: Renaissance Drawings, Prints and Books*, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island

Airs, M. (ed) 1994, *The Tudor and Jacobean Great House*, Dept of Continuing Education: Oxford

Anderson, M. D. 1995 (repr), *History and Images in British Churches*, London

Anglo, S. 1992, *Images of Tudor Kingship*, London

Antonovics, A. V. 1995, 'Il semble que ce soit là un vrai Paradis': Charles VIII's conquest of Naples and the French Renaissance, in D. Abulafia (ed) *The French Descent into Renaissance Italy 1494-95*, Aldershot

Archer, I. W. 2004, 'Courtenay, Edward, earl of Devon (1526-1556), ODNB

Arminjon, C., Lavalle, D., Chatenet, M, and d'Athenaise, C. 2004, *De l'Italie à Chambord. François Ier et la chevauchée des princes français*, Paris

Baggs, A. P. 1968, 'Sixteenth-century terracotta tombs in East Anglia', *Archaeol J*, **125**, 295-301

Ball, A. W. 1999, *Winchester Illustrated*, London

Ball, C. 1818, *An Historical Account of Winchester with Descriptive Walks*, Winchester

Bartrum, G. 1995, *German Renaissance Prints*, London

Baumgartner, F J 1994, *Louis XII*, New York

Bayley, E. W. and Britton, J. 1805, *Description of the County of Hampshire*, London

Bebb, R 1992, Carved Oak Furniture from Tudor Wales, *Regional Furniture*, **6**, 63-73

Begent, P. J., Chesshyre, H. and Jefferson, L. 1999, *The Most Noble Order of the Garter*, London

Berry, W. 1933, *County Genealogies. Pedigrees of the families in the County of Hampshire*, London

Bey, M. C. 1993, *Rouen: Cathédrale Notre-Dame les verrières*, Itinéraires du Patrimoine, 25, Inventaire Général S.P.A.D.E.M. : Rouen and Paris

Biddle, M. 1993, 'Early Renaissance at Winchester', in J. Crook (ed) 1993

------ 2000, *King Arthur's Round Table*, Woodbridge

Blagden, T. 1796, *The Winchester Guide*, Winchester

Blatchly, J and Middleton-Stewart, J. 2002, 'Sir Philip Bothe of Shrubland: The Last of a Distinguished Line Builds in Commemoration', in Harper-Bill *et al*, 2002, 123-48

Blomfield, R. 1897, *A History of Renaissance Architecture in England, 1500-1800*, London

Blunt, A. 1969, 'L'influence Française sur l'architecture et la sculpture décorative en Angleterre pendant la première moitié du XVIme siècle', *Revue de l'Art*, **4**, 17-29

------ 1973, *Art and Architecture in France, 1500 to 1700*, London

Bober, P. P. and Rubinstein, R. O. 1986, *Renaissance artists and antique sculpture*, OUP

Bottineau-Fuchs, Y. 1982, 'La Décoration des Tombeau des Cardinaux d'Amboise A La Cathédrale de Rouen: Arnoult de Nimègue ou Nicolas Castille', *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, **6/100**, 191-200

------ 1985, 'A propos de Quelque Représentations du Tombeau des Cardinaux D'Amboise', *Annales de Normandie*, 1 March 1985, 17-37

Bond, F. 1910, *Stalls and Tabernacle work*, London

------ 1916, *The Chancel of English Churches*, London

Boorsch, S, Christiansen, K, Ekserdjian, D, Hope, C, Landau, D, et al 1992, *Andrea Mantegna*, New York and London

Bramstow, A. R. and Leroy, A. C. 1882, *Historic Winchester*, Winchester

Brown, M.P. 1990, *A Guide to Western Historiated Scripts from Antiquity to 1600*, London

Brown University, 1980, *Ornament and Architecture: Renaissance Drawings, Prints and Books*, Providence, Rhode Island

Buckard, F. et Chirol, E., 1980, *La Renaissance à Rouen*, Exhibition Catalogue, Musée des Beaux-Arts des Rouen, Rouen

Callé. M. 2002, 'Winchester Cathedral medieval Glass in Australia', *J Stained Glass*, **26**, 67-74

Carley, J. P. 2004, 'Marney, Henry, first Baron Marney (1456/7-1523)' ODNB

Carter, J. 1838 (2nd ed), *Specimens of the Ancient Sculpture and Painting in England*, London

Carter, O. B. 1845, *A series of ancient painted glass in Winchester Cathedral*, Winchester

Campbell, J. and Pryce, W. 2003, *Brick*, London

Cave, C. J. P. 1927, 'The Bosses on the Vault of the Quire of Winchester Cathedral', *Archaeologia*, **76**, 161-78

------ 1935, *The Roof Bosses of Winchester Cathedral*, Winchester

Chastel, A. (trans D. Dusinberre) 1995, *French Art. The Renaissance 1430-1620*, Paris

Chaussé, V. 1994, *Rouen: Eglise Sainte-Jeanne D'Arc*, Itinéraires du Patrimoine, 67, Inventaire Général S.P.A.D.E.M., Rouen and Paris

Cherry, B. and Pevsner, N. 1991, *The Buildings of England. Devon*, London

Cherry, J., 1991, 'Pottery and Tile', in J. Blair and N. Ramsey (eds) *English Medieval Industries*, London

------, 1997, 'The Farnham Pin', *Antiquaries Journal*, 77, 388-93

Cheetham, F. W. 1962, *English Alabasters*, Castle Museum, Nottingham

Chinnery, V. 1979, *Oak Furniture*, Antique Collectors Club.

Childs, H. and Colles, D. 1960, *Christian Symbols. Ancient and Modern*, London

Chirol, E. 1952, *Le Château de Gaillon*, Rouen

------ 1993, *La Renaissance A Rouen*, Connaître Rouen, **6**, Rouen

Chirol, E., Lanfry, G. and Bailly, J. 1959, *Le tombeau des Cardinaux d'Amboise*, Rouen

Chrimes, S. B. 1999 (new ed.), *Henry VII*, London

Coad, J. G. 1986, *Calshot Castle, Hampshire*, HMSO guidebook, London

Cooper, N. 1994, 'Sutton Place, East Barsham and Some Related Houses: Some Problems Arising', in M. Airs (ed.), *The Tudor and Jacobean Great House*, Department of Continuing Education, Oxford, 33-54.

------, 1999, *Houses of the Gentry*, New Haven & London

Colvin, H. M. 1975, *The History of the King's Works*, **III**, London

Cowie, R. and Cloake, J. 2001, 'An archaeological survey of Richmond Palace, Surrey', *Post Med Archaeol* **35**, 3-52

Croft-Murray, E. 1956, 'Lambert Barnard: An English Early Renaissance Painter', *Archaeological Journal*, **113**, 108-25

------1962, *Decorative painting in England 1537-1837*, London

Croft-Murray, E. and Hulton, P. 1960, *British Museum Catalogue of British Drawings*, 2 vols, London

Crook, J. 1993 (ed), *Winchester Cathedral. Nine Hundred Years*, Chichester

------ 2003, 'Early historians of Winchester cathedral', *Proc Hampsh Field Club Archaeol Soc*, **58**, 226-241

Croslegh, C. 1912 (repr 1993), *Notes on St Disen's Church, Bradninch*, Bradninch PCC

Cruickshank, C. 1990, *Henry VIII and the Invasion of France*, Stroud.

Davies, C.S.L. 2004, 'Fox, Richard (1447/8-1528)', ODNB

Dollman, F. T. 1858, *Ancient Domestic Architecture*, London

Dollman, F T and Jobbins, J R, 1861, (re-issued 1890) *An Analysis of Ancient Domestic Architecture*, **1**, London

Donovan, C. 1993, *The Winchester Bible*, British Library & Winchester Cathedral

Drake, M and Drake, W, 1916 (repr 1971), *Saints and Their Emblems*, New York

Draper, P., and Morris, R. K., 1993, 'The Development of the east End of Winchester Cathedral from the 13th to the 16th century', in J. Crook (ed) 1993

Dunlop, I, 1969, *Châteaux of the Loire*, London

Duthy, J. 1839 (Oxley reprint 1972), *Sketches of Hampshire*, Alresford

Eames, E. 1992, *Medieval Craftsmen. English Tiler*, London

Elsner, J. 1998, *Imperial Rome and the Christian Triumph*, OUP

Erlande-Brandenburg, A. 1984a, *The Abbey Church of Saint-Denis (Paris), I, History and Visit*, Paris

——, 1984b, *The Abbey Church of Saint-Denis (Paris), II, The Royal Tombs*, Paris

Evett, D, 1990, *Literature and the Visual Arts in Tudor England*, Athens and London

Fligny, L. 1991, *Mobilier picard: le Meuble dans l'Oise du XIII^e au XIX^e siècle*, Paris

Ford, D. and Turner, M. 2004, 'The Kynges New Haull: A response to Jonathan Foyle's 'Reconstruction of Thomas Wolsey's Great Hall at Hampton Court Palace', *Architectural History*, **47**, 53-76

Ford, L. L.2004, 'Paulet, William, first marquess of Winchester (1474/5?-1572)', ODNB

Förstel, J. and Magnien, A. 1998, *Beauvais Cathédrale, Oise*, [English edition], Itinéraires du Patrimoine, 139, Inventaire Général, Amiens and Paris

Foyle, J. 2002, 'A Reconstruction of Thomas Wolsey's Great Hall at Hampton Court Palace', *Architectural History*, **45**, 128-58

Förstel, J. and Magnien, A. 1998, *Beauvais Cathédrale, Oise*, Itinéraires du Patrimoine, **139**, Inventaire Général, Amiens and Paris

Friar, S. 1996, *Companion to the English Parish Church*, Godalming

Fritze, R. H. 2004, 'Sandys, William, first Baron Sandys (c.1470-1540)', ODNB

Gaimster, D. R. M. et al 1999, Appendix II. 'Armorial Stove-Tiles Excavated in 1939' and Appendix III 'Medieval Imported Stove-Tiles Excavated in 1964 at the banqueting House Site, Whitehall', in S. Thurley, *Whitehall Palace*, New Haven and London

Galvin, C. and Lindley, P. 1988, 'Pietro Torrigiano's tomb for Dr Yonge', *Church Monuments*, **III**, 42-60.

Gentilini, G., Petrucci, F. and Domestici, F, 1999, *Della Robbia*, Florence

Goff, Lady C. 1930, *A Woman of the Tudor Age*, London

Gotch, J. A. 1901, *Early Renaissance Architecture in England*, London

Graham, D 1997, 'The case of the gold and sapphire Tudor pin from Farnham Park' *Surrey Archaeological Collections*, **86**, 264-66

Graham-Dixon, A. 1999, *Renaissance*, London

Graham, R. & Rigold, S. E. 1976, *Titchfield Abbey*, HMSO guidebook: London

Gray, N. 1986, *A History of Lettering*, Oxford

Griffiths, R. A. 1993, *Sir Rhys ap Thomas and his Family. A Study in the Wars of the Roses and Early Tudor Politics*, Cardiff: University of Wales Press

Griffiths, R. A., and Thomas, R. S. 1998, *The Making of the Tudor Dynasty*, Stroud

Gruber, A (ed.) 1994 (English trans) *The History of Decorative Arts. The Renaissance and Mannerism in Europe*, New York

Guillaume, J. 2003, *L'Invention de la Renaissance. La réception des formes "À L'Antique" au début de la Renaissance*, Actes du colloque tenu à Tours du 1er au 4 Juin 1994. Paris

Guignard, B., Bellenger, S., Guillaume, J. et al, 1993, *Blois*, Société Française de Promotion Artistique, Paris

Gunn, S. J. 2004, 'Courtenay, Peter, first earl of Devon (d.1509)', ODNB

------- 2004, 'Daubeney, Giles, first Baron Daubeney (1451/2-1508)', ODNB

------- and Lindley, P.G. 1991, 'Charles Brandon's Westhorpe: an Early Tudor Courtyard House in Suffolk', *Archaeol Journal*, **145**, 272-89

------- and Lindley, P.G., 1991, *Cardinal Wolsey: Church, State and Art*, CUP

Gwyn,P. 1990, *The King's Cardinal*, London

Gwynne, P. 1992, 'The frontispiece to an illuminated panegyric of Henry VII: a note on the sources', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes*, **55**, 266-70

Hall, J. 1996 (re print, 1974 1st ed.), *Dictionary of Subject and Symbols in Art*, London

Hamilton Thompson, A. 1953 (1980, twelfth impression), *Netley Abbey*, HMSO guidebook: London

Hardacre, J. 1989, *Winchester Cathedral, Triforium Gallery. Sculpture. Woodwork and Metalwork from Eleven Centuries*, Winchester

Hare, J. N. 1987, *Bishop's Waltham Palace*, English Heritage guidebook: London

------ 1988, 'Bishop's Waltham Palace, Hampshire: William of Wykeham, Henry Beaufort and the transformation of a Medieval Episcopal Palace', *Archaeol J*, **145**, 222-54

------ 1999, *The Dissolution of the Monasteries in Hampshire*, Hampshire Papers **16**, Winchester

Harper-Bill, C., Rawcliffe, C., and Wilson, R. G. 2002, *East Anglia's History. Studies in Honour of Norman Scarf*, Woodbridge

------- 2004, 'Morton, John (d.1500)', ODNB

------- 2004, 'Sherborn [Sherburne], Robert (c.1454-1536)', ODNB

Harrison, F. 1893, *Annals of an Old Manor House*, London

------, 1899, (abridged ed), *Annals of an Old Manor House*, London

Harrison, K. 1952, *The Windows of King's College, Cambridge*, Cambridge

Harrisson, W.[nd], *Illustrated catalogue of the oak carvings and stalls, chantry chapel, The Vyne*, privately published for The National Trust

Harvey, J.H. 1984 (rev edn), *English Mediaeval Architects. A Biographical Dictionary down to 1550*, Gloucester

Heal, F. 2004, 'West, Nicholas (d. 1533)', ODNB

Hicks, M. 2004, 'Lisle [de Lisle] family (*per. c.*1277-1542)', ODNB

Huggins, A. 1894, 'On the work of Florentine sculptors in England in the early part of the sixteenth-century: with special reference to the tombs of Cardinal Wolsey and King Henry VIII', in *Archaeol Journal*, **51**, 129-220

Hobson, G. D. 1944, *Blind-Stamped panels in the English book-trade, 1485-1555*, London

Holman, B. 1997, *Disegno, Italian Renaissance Designs for the Decorative Arts*, Exhibition catalogue, Cooper-Hewitt *National Design Museum* University Press of New England

Hopewell, P. 1995, *St. Cross*, Chichester

Horrox, R. 2004, 'Courtenay, Peter (c.1432-1492)', ODNB

Howard, F. E. and Crossley, F. H. 1933 (2nd ed), *English Church Woodwork*, London

Howard, M. 1983, *The Renaissance at Sutton Place*, Sutton Place Heritage Trust.

------ 1987, *The early Tudor country house: architecture and politics*, London

------ 1991, 'Laughton Place: the Tudor house and its terracottas', *Sussex Archaeol Coll*, **129**, 133-52

------ 1998, *The Vyne, Hampshire*, National Trust guidebook: London

------ 2003, 'All'Antica Ornament: its Use and Limitations in England (1520-1550), in J. Guillaume, (ed) *L'Invention de la Renaissance. La réception des formes "À L'Antique" au début de la Renaissance.* Actes du colloque tenu à Tours du 1er au 4 Juin 1994., Paris, 55-66

------ and Wilson, E, 2003, *The Vyne. A Tudor House Revealed*, London

Huggins, A. 1894, 'On the work of Florentine sculptors in England in the early part of the sixteenth-century: with special reference to the tombs of Cardinal Wolsey and King Henry VIII', in *Archaeol Journal*, **51**, 129-220

Humbert, L. M. 1868, *Memorials of the Hospital of St. Cross*, London

Iacopi, I. 2001, *Domus Aurea*, Milan

James, T. B., 1997, *Winchester*, London

Jenkins, S. 1999, *England's Thousand Best Churches*, London

Jervis, S. 1976, *Woodwork of Winchester Cathedral*, Winchester

Johnson, M. 2004, 'Ruthall, Thomas (d.1523)', ODNB

Jones, M, 2002, 'German and Flemish prints as design-sources for the misericords in St George's Chapel, Windsor (1477x84)', in L. Keen and E. Scarff, *Windsor. Medieval Archaeology, Art and Architecture of the Thames Valley*, Brit Archaeol Assoc Conf Trans **25**, 155-65

Jouanneaux, F. and Malnoury, R. 2000, *Le Tour du chœur de la cathédrale de Chartres*, Images du Patrimoine, Inventaire général des monuments et des richesses de la France. Région Centre, Orléans

Joy, E. T. 1964, *Woodwork in Winchester Cathedral*, Winchester

Kanter, L. 1983, *Luca Signorelli. Orvieto, Chapel of San Brizio*, Firenze

Kanter, L. B. 2002, *The Complete Paintings of Luca Signorelli*, London

Kenyon, J. R. 1978, *Castles, town defences and artillery fortifications in Britain: a bibliography 1945-74*, CBA Research Report **25**

-----, 1983, *Castles, town defences and artillery fortifications in Britain and Ireland: a bibliography Volume 2*, CBA Research Report **53**

Knecht, R. J. 1994, *Renaissance Warrior and Patron. The Reign of Francis I.* Cambridge

-----1996, *The Rise and Fall of Renaissance France*, London

Kipling, G. ed, 1990, *The Receyt of Lady Kateryne*, OUP

-----, 1998, *Enter the King*, Clarendon, Oxford

Kitson, M. and Shearman, J. 1967, *Studies in Renaissance and Baroque Art presented to Anthony Blunt on his 60th birthday*, London

La Costé-Messelière, M. C. 1957, 'Les medallions historiques de Gaillon au Museé de Louvre et à l'Ecole des Beaux Arts', *Revue des Arts*, 65-70

Le Couteur, J. D. 1920, 'Notes on the Ancient Painted Glass In Winchester Cathedral', *Proc Hampshire Field Club*, **8**, 139-166

Lees-Milne, J. 1951, *Tudor Renaissance*, London

Lehmberg, S. 2004, 'Weston, Sir Richard (c.1465-1541)', ODNB

Lesueur, P. 1935, 'Pacello de Mercogliano et la jardins d'Amboise, Blois et Gaillon', *Bulletin de la Societé de l'Histoire de l'Art Française*, 90-117

Letterton, I. 1992, *Rouen: L'hôtel de Bourgtheroulde et sa galerie*, Itinéraires du Patrimoine, **9**, Inventaire Général S.P.A.D.E.M., Rouen and Paris

Levenson, J., Oberhuber, K., and Sheehan, J. L. 1973, *Early Italian Engravings from the National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1973*, Washington

Lewis, E. 1996, 'A Sixteenth-century painted ceiling from Winchester College' *Hampshire Studies*, 51, 137-65

Lindley, P. 1988, 'The Sculptural Programme of Bishop Fox's Chantry Chapel', *Winchester Cathedral Record*, **57**, 33-37

------, 1989, 'The Great Screen of Winchester Cathedral, I', *Burlington Magazine*, **131**, 604-15

------, 1991, 'Playing check-mate with royal majesty? Wolsey's patronage of Italian Renaissance sculpture', in S. J. Gunn and P. Lindley, *Cardinal Wolsey. Church, State and Art*, Cambridge, 261-85

------, 1993, 'The Medieval Sculpture of Winchester Cathedral', in J. Crook (ed.), *op cit*, 97-122

------,1995, *Gothic to Renaissance*, Stamford

------, 1997, 'Innovations, Tradition and Disruption in Tomb-Sculpture', in D. Gaimster and P. Stamper (eds) *The Age of Transition. The Archaeology of English Culture 1400-1600*, Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph **15**, 77-92

Lindley, P. and Frangenberg, T. 2000, *Secular Sculpture 1300-1550*, Stamford

Llewellyn, N. 1989, 'Accident or design? John Gildon's funeral monuments and Italianate taste in Elizabethan England', in E. Chaney and P. Mack (eds), *England and the Continental Renaissance. Essays in honour of J. B. Trapp*, Suffolk

Lloyd, C. 1991, *Andrea Mantegna. The Triumphs of Caesar*, London

Loades, D. 2004, 'Mary Tudor (1496-1533)', ODNB

Luchinat, C. A. 1999, *Pintoricchio.* Florence

Mâle, E. 1906, 'Un Influence Des Mystères Sur L'Art Italien du XV Siècle', *Gazette des Beaux Arts*, **35**, 89-94.

----- 1949, *L'art Religieux de la fin du Moyen Age en France*, Paris

Marks, R. 1984, 'The Howard Tombs at Thetford and Framlingham: New Discoveries', *Archaeol Journal* **141**, 252-68

----- 1993, *Stained Glass in England during the Middle Ages*, London

Marks, R. and Williamson, P. 2003, *Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547*, London

Milner, J. 1798-99 (1st ed), *The History and Survey of the Antiquities of Winchester*, 2 vols, Winchester

Mineray, J. 1991, *Récits et documents pour servir à l'histoire de Gaillon et D'Alentour*, Luneray

Morris, R. K. 2000, 'Architectural terracotta decoration in Tudor England', in Lindley and Fragenberg 2000, 179-210.

Morley, J. 1999, *The History of Furniture*, London

Moody, H. *c.*1840, *A History and Description of the Hospital of St Cross near Winchester*, Winchester

Nairn, I. and Pevsner, N. 1965, *The Buildings of England. Sussex*, London

Nairn, I. and Pevsner, (rev) Cherry, B, 1971, *The Buildings of England. Surrey*, London

Newman, J. and Pevsner, N. 1972, *The Buildings of England. Dorset*, London

O'Malley, G. J. 2004, 'Weston, Sir William (b. after 1469 – d.1540)' ODNB

Park, D. and Welford, P. 1993, 'The Medieval Polychromy of Winchester Cathedral', 134-5, in J Crook (ed) 1993, 123-138

Perry, M. 1998, *Sisters to the King*, London

Pevsner, N. 1958, *The Buildings of England. Shropshire*, London.

-----, 1962a, *The Buildings of England. North East Norfolk and Norwich*, London

------, 1962b, *The Buildings of England. North West and South Norfolk,* London

------, 1963, *The Buildings of England. Herefordshire,* London

------, 1977 (repr) *Buildings of England. Cornwall,* London

------, 2001 (repr) *The Buildings of England. South and West Somerset,* London

Pevsner, N. and Lloyd, D. 1967, *The Buildings of England. Hampshire and the Isle of Wight,* reprint, 1985 London

Pevsner, N. and Hubbard, E. 1971, *The Buildings of England. Cheshire,* London

Pevsner, N and Radcliffe, E. 1965, *The Buildings of England. Essex,* London

------, and Radcliffe, E. (rev)1975, *The Buildings of England. Suffolk,* London

Pierce, H. 2004, 'Pole, Margaret, *suo jure* countess of Suffolk (1473-1541)', ODNB

Pinches, J. H. and R.V. 1974, *The Royal Heraldry of Britain,* Heraldry Today

Pine, J. and Preston, S. 2004, 'Early Medieval Settlement on land adjoining Froman's, Cow Drove Hill, King's Somborne, Hampshire', *Proc Hampsh Field Club & Archaeol Soc,* **59**, 139-62.

Platt, C. 1986, *Late Medieval and Renaissance Britain,* London

Powys, A. R. 1930, *The English Parish Church,* London

Purvis, J. S. 1935, 'The Use of Continental Woodcuts and Prints by the 'Ripon School' of Woodcarvers in the early sixteenth century', *Archaeologia,* **85**, 107-28

Quirk, R. N. 1953, 'A Tour of the Cathedral before the Civil War', *Winchester Cathedral Record* **22**, 9-15.

Riall, N. 1994, *Henry of Blois, Bishop of Winchester. A Patron of the Twelfth-Century Renaissance,* Hampshire Papers **5**, Winchester

------, 1997, 'A medieval tile kiln in Farnham Park', *Surrey Archaeol Coll,* **84**, 143-168

------, 2003a, 'Excavation at Borelli Yard, Farnham: the tile kiln', *Surrey Archaeol Coll,* **90**, 295-336

------, 2003b, 'Thomas Silkstede's Renaissance-Styled Canopied Woodwork in the South Transept of Winchester Cathedral', *Hampshire Studies,* **58**, 209-25

------, 2003c, 'The New castles of Henry de Blois as bishop of Winchester: The Case against Farnham, Surrey', *Med Archaeol,* **48**, 115-130

------, 2004, Review: 'Gothic: Art for England 1400-1547', *Renaissance Studies,* **18/2**,

321-27

------, 2005, Review: The Marriage of England and Spain. (Winchester Cathedral, 30 June - 30 September 2004), *Renaissance Studies*, **19/2**, 240-43

------, forthcoming, 'Review: Barney Sloane and Gordon Malcolm, *Excavations at the Priory of the Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, Clerkenwell, London.* Museum of London Archaeology Service Monograph 20.', in *Renaissance Studies*

Rieder, W. 1977, 'French sixteenth-century *boiserie* and furniture', *Apollo*, **106**, Nov 1977, 350-357

Roberts, E. 2004, 'Medieval Hambledon Manor: Chambers for Bishops and their Stewards', *Hampshire Studies*, **59**, 180-195.

Roberts, R. E. 2000, *Misericords and other Carvings in the Great Quire, Christchurch Priory, Dorset*, Shropshire

Rosci, M. and Chastel, A. 1963, 'Un Château Français en Italie', *Art de France*, **3**, 103-13

Rossi, F., Graziano, A. P., and Mancinelli, F., 1992, *Michelangelo and Raphael in the Vatican*, Vatican City

Rothwell, E. 1997, *The Misericords and Screen in Cartmel Priory*, Cartmel Priory

Round, J.H. 1910, *Peerage and Pedigree*, **I**, London

Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England, *Dorset*, **I**, *West*, London.

------ 1987, *Churches of South-East Wiltshire*, London

St John Hope, W. H. 1906, 'The making of Place house at Titchfield near Southampton, in 1538', *Archaeol Journal*, **63**, 231-243

Salmi, M. 1956, *La Miniatura Italiana*, Milan

Scarisbrick, J. J. 2004, 'Warham, William (1450 –1532)', ODNB

Sergeant, P. W. 1903, *The Cathedral Church of Winchester*, London

Shaw, H. and Meyrick, Sir S. R. 1836, *Specimens of ancient furniture*, London

Sicca, C. M. 2002, 'Consumption and trade of art between Italy and England in the first half of the sixteenth century: the London house of the Bardi and Cavalcanti company', *Renaissance Studies*, **16/2**, 163-201

Slader, J. M. 1968, *The Churches of Devon*, Newton Abbot

Sloane, B. and Malcolm, G. 2004, *Excavations at the Priory of the Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, Clerkenwell, London*, London.

Smith, A. 1988b, 'The Chantry Chapel of Bishop Fox', *Winchester Cathedral Record* **57**, 27-32

------, 1996, *Roof Bosses of Winchester Cathedral*, Friends of Winchester Cathedral

------, 2002, 'An oak chest made for Prior Silkstede', *Winchester Cathedral Record* **71**, 14-19

Smith, A. and Riall, N. 2002, 'Early Tudor Canopywork at the Hospital of St Cross, Winchester', *Antiq J*, **82**, 125-56

Smith, J. C. D. 1969, *Church Woodcarvings. A West Country Study*, Newton Abbot

Smith, T. P. 2004, 'The architectural terracottas', in B. Sloane and Gordon Malcolm, *Excavations at the priory of the Order of the Hospital of St John of Jerusalem, Clerkenwell, London*, 297-320

Snodin, M and Howard, M.1996, *Ornament, A Social History Since 1450*, London

Sotheby's 2001, *Applied Arts. Country Furniture, Works of Art, British Pottery and Porcelain. Sussex 19 and 20 June 2001*, Sotheby's

Speltz, A. 1959, *The Styles of Ornament*, New York

Starkey, D. 2004, *Six Wives. The Queens of Henry VIII*, London

Souchal, G. 1976, 'Le Mécénat de la Famille D'Amboise', *bull de la Soc des Antiquaires de L'Ouest et des Musées des Poitiers*, **13**, 485-526 and 567-612

Stone, P. G. 1890, *The Architectural Antiquities of the Isle of Wight*, London

Stone, L. and Colvin, H. 1965, 'The Howard Tombs at Framlingham, Suffolk', *Archaeol Journal*, **122**, 159-71.

Summerson, Sir J., 1993, (9th ed), *Architecture in Britain 1530-1830*, London

Tasker, E. G. 1993, *Encyclopaedia of Medieval Church Art*, London

Tatton-Brown, T. and Mortimer, R. 2003, (eds), *Westminster Abbey. The Lady Chapel of Henry VII*, London

Taylor, R. 2003, *How to Read a Church*, London

Thomson, D, 1984, *Renaissance Paris. Architecture and Growth 1475-1600*, London

------ 1988, *Les plus excellents bâtiments en France par J.-A Du Cerceau*, Paris

Thompson, M. P. 1960 'The date of "Fox's Tower" Farnham Castle, Surrey', *Surrey Archaeol Coll*, **57**, 85-92.

------, 1960b, 'Recent Excavations in the keep of Farnham Castle, Surrey', *Med Archaeol*, **4**, 81-94

Thornton, P. 1998, *Form and Decoration. Innovation in the Decorative Arts 1470-1870.* London

Thurley, S. 1993, *The Royal Palaces of Tudor England*, New Haven and London

------ 1998, *The Lost Palace of Whitehall*, London

------ 1999, *Whitehall Palace*, New Haven and London

------ 2003, *Hampton Court. A Social and Architectural History*, New Haven and London

Tracy, C. 1990, *English Gothic Choir Stalls, 1400-1540*, Woodbridge.

------, 1993, 'The Lady Chapel Stalls' in J. Crook (ed) *op. cit.*, 231-246

Vasselot, J. J. M de 1927, 'Les boiseries de Gaillon au Musée de Cluny', *Bulletin Monumental*, **86**, 321-69

Vaughan J. 1919, *Winchester Cathedral: its monuments and memorials*, London

Verey, D and Brooks, A 1999 (3rd ed), *Buildings of England. Gloucestershire I, The Cotswolds*, London

Victoria County History of Hampshire, in five volumes, London:

Volume 2, ed. H. A. Doubleday and W. Page, 1903

Volume 3, ed. W. Page, 1908

Volume 4, ed. W. Page, 1911

Volume 5, ed. W. Page, 1912

Victoria County History of Surrey, in four volumes, London:

Volume 2, ed. H. E. Malden, 1905

Volume 3, ed. H. E. Malden, 1911

Volume 4, ed. H. E. Malden, 1912

Virdis, C. L. and Pietrogiovanna, 2002, *Gothic and Renaissance Altarpieces*, London

Visser, M. 2000, *The Geometry of Love*, Toronto

Wabuda, S. 2004, 'Bertie, Richard (1517-1582)', ODNB

------- 2004, 'Willoughby (Brandon, Bertie) duchess of Suffolk (1519-1580)', ODNB

Warren, F. T. 1899, *St Cross Hospital*, Winchester

Warren, F. T. 1902, *Winchester Illustrated*, Winchester

Ward, W. H. 1926, *The Architecture of the Renaissance in France, 1495-1830.* **1.** *The Early Renaissance.* London.

Warton, T. [1760], *A Description of the City, College and Cathedral of Winchester,* London

Wayment, H. 1972, *The Windows of King's College Chapel, Cambridge*, London

----, 1982, 'The stained glass in the chapel of The Vyne' in *Archaeologia*, **107**, 141-52

----, 1984, *The Stained Glass of the Church of St Mary, Fairford, Gloucestershire*, Society of Antiquaries of London

Webber, F. R. 1927, *Church Symbolism*, Cleveland (USA).

Weiss, R. 1953, 'The Castle of Gaillon in 1509-10', *J Warburg and Courtauld Inst*, **16**, 1-12

Wenzler, C. 1999, *Architecture du Château Renaissance*, Editions Ouest-France

Whinney, M. 1964, *Sculpture in Britain 1530-1830*, London

Williams, N. 1973, *The Life and Times of Henry VII*, London

Woodman, F. 1986, *The Architectural History of King's College Chapel*, London

Woodman, F. 1981, *the Architectural history of Canterbury Cathedral*, London

Woodward, B. B. 1861 (facsimile reprint 1974), *A History and Description of Winchester*, Alresford

Woolfson, J. 1997, 'John Claymond, Pliny the Elder, and the Early History of Corpus Christi College, Oxford', *English Historical Review*, **112**, 882-903

-------, 2003, 'Bishop Fox's bees and the early English Renaissance', *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, **5.1**, 7-26

-------, 2004 'Claymond, John (1467/8-1536)', ODNB

Wight, J. A. 1972, *Brick Building in England from the Middle Ages to 1550*, John Baker: London

Wright, D. P. 2004, 'Langton, Thomas (c.1430-1501)', ODNB